

The SPIRIT of
Calumny and Slander,

Examin'd, Chaftis'd, and Expos'd,

IN A
LETTER

TO A
MALICIOUS LIBELLER.

MORE

Particularly Address'd to Mr. GEORGE RIDPATH,
Newsmonger, near St. Martins in the Fields.

CONTAINING

Some Animadversions on his Scurrilous Pamphlets,
Published by him against the Kings, Parliaments, Laws,
Nobility and Clergy of Scotland.

TOGETHER

With a short account of Presbyterian
Principles and Consequential Practices.

Alexander Monro, D. D.

Tenne est mendacium, perlucet si diligenter inspexeris.

Senec.

London: Printed for Joseph Hindmarsh, at the Golden-Ball
over against the Royal Exchange. 1693.

The SPIRIT of
Calumny and Slander
 Examined, Chastised, and Exposed,
 IN A
LETTER
 TO A
MALICIOUS LIBELLER

MORE
 Particularly Address'd to Mr. George RIDPATH,
 Newington, near St. Martin in the Fields.

CONTAINING
 Some Animadversions on his Scandalous Pamphlets,
 Published by him against the Kings, Parliaments, Laws,
 Nobility and Clergy of Scotland.

TOGETHER
 With a short account of Presbyterian
 Principles and Confessional Practices.

Tamne est mendacium, perit et diligerit infamia.
 Senec.

W

London: Printed for Joseph Sturges, at the Golden-Ball
 over against the Royal Exchange. 1693.

TO THE READER.

IT is not much worth the while to inform the World, that now Mr. *George Ridpath* is at the Head of the Presbyterian Party in *Scotland*. His Associates there, and here, have such an Opinion of him, that they consider him as the Invincible Champion of their Cause; and the truth is, if any Man be so inconsiderable, and so much a Brute, as to fight him at his own Weapons, Mr. *Ridpath* will certainly carry the Prize. He's the Man, that is now most likely to pull down *Antichrist*, and the *Whore* of *Babylon*. And as for the *Scotch Episcopal Clergy* who yet retain any kindness for the *Hierarchy*, and the former Government, if he lives another year, they must all of them be banish'd the *Isle* of *Britain*. It is enough for you to know, that now the Presbyterians, as is probable, have by an unanimous Suffrage chosen him to manage the Libels against their Opposites. He now appears in the Field of Battle, with all the Noise,

To the Reader.

Lies, and Clamour, that becomes a Zealous Covenantant. He began this last years Campaign with a Libel against Dr. M---o, which valuable Book he Dedicated to the Parliament of Scotland; by this, one may easily infer, that either he had a mean Opinion of the Parliament, or extraordinary thoughts of himself.

If the following Treatise cannot be reduced into any certain Method, this is not to be imputed unto me; for I must confess that I too much followed the Excursions of Mr. Ridpath's invention. I was willing to contract the Animadversions that I made upon his Book into as little room as was possible; and therefore the frequent Transitions from one thing to another, are best understood, by such as have Read his Continuation, &c. I hope most Men are better employed than either to think or speak of the Calumnies and Lies, that he industriously heaps together against the Clergy. His Party is resolv'd to make use of such Engines against the Church, as they and their Fore-Fathers found most successful to the Extirpation of Root and Branch; and they that are unacquainted with their Malicious Methods, are great Strangers to our Nation, and History.

If the Reader meet with some Paragraphs that are more particular, and peculiar to Mr. Ridpath, than the Publick is oblig'd to take notice of, I must be excus'd, since I was compell'd; for I assure you,

that

To the Reader.

that I value personal altercations no other wise than a good Christian ought to do by. Nor did I ever Write to satisfy or convince Mr. Ridpath, that being a thing in it self impossible. There is a certain Order of Mean Spirited Fellows (I do not mean by their External Qualities) who think that there is nothing written by their Party, (were it never so ignominiously foolish and scandalous) but what is invincible and unanswerable. Their Pride, and Vanity are incurable. It is not my meaning that we ought to put ourselves to the Drudgery of answering all the Scurrilous and Obscene Libels that are propagated by our Enemies; but 'tis reasonable to let our Friends see that at some times we can Confute them if that be though convenient. I am so far convinced of the Weakness of their Reasonings, that I know no Sect, Ancient or Modern, that ever broke the Peace of the Christian Church; but may be more plausibly defended, than the latest Edition of Presbytery in Scotland. and I do not think that the Reputation of my Friend was in any hazard by being attack'd by Mr. Ridpath, or the Little Creatures who instigate him; yet by the following Papers, I make it plain to all disinterested persons, that Mr. Ridpath lies Willfully and Deliberately in several Instances; and therefore I may be allow'd to take leave of him for the future; if he does not manage his Accusations, as becomes

the

To the Reader.

the Spirit of Truth, Innocence, and Ingenuity. If you think that the Style is more sharp than is Decent or Just, then I intreat you may Read his Books which occasion'd these Papers, and then I am confident that you will retract your Censure, and find that I have meddled with his Person (as little as was possible. He is in some places so Obscene that there is no coming near him, and therefore I made all possible haste to rid my imagination of him, and the poultry Trash that he gathers together.

The Bookseller was willing to Print a Sheet or two more than the Letter that I address'd to Mr. Ridpath, and therefore I gave him some Propositions that are extracted out of such Books as are most in Vogue amongst the Scotch Presbyterians, that the Reader might have a sample of their Moral Theology with regard to Obedience, Government, and Subjection. To which I have added a Letter, written from the Tolbooth of Edinburgh by the Famous Assassin Mr. James Mitchel, who endeavours to prove from severall Texts of Scripture, that he ought to kill Dr. Sharp, Lord Archbishop of St. Andrews. In short, to use the words of a Great Man, *Rebellion is the Soul of the Kirk.* And though we had not known the History of that Parliament Anno 1645. (So they call'd the bloody Meeting at St. Andrews) we have later Instances of their Arbitrary and Tyrannical Malice against the better half

of

To the Reader.

of the Nation. Their very Patrons are ashamed of them (not through any ingenuous remorse) but because their bare faced Villanies are frequently expos'd. I think the following Letter needs no other Preface than what is already hinted by

Sir,

Your humble Servant,

S. W.

The

The CONTENTS.

THE Occasion of this Letter.

Mr. Ridpath, the Author of two or three Scarrifons
and abusive Pamphlets against the Kings, Parliaments, Laws,
Nobility, and Clergy of Scotland. Page 1

his Rage and Passion against the Author of the Apology for
the Clergy of Scotland Ibid.

his Challenge fairly embrac'd. The Author of this Defence
undertakes to prove that there is not a good Consequence in
Mr. Ridpath's Books from the beginning to the end. P. 12

the Character bestowed upon Mr. Rushford by the Author of
the Apology, no justifiable ground of Mr. Ridpath's cla-
morous hawling against the Dearn'd Advocate. Ibid.

Mr. Ridpath's accusation against Sir George Mackenzie in
the case of C. of C. founded only on his own Petulance and
Malice Ibid. P. 3

Ridiculous advices to the Ministers of State in England,
and his Civilities to K. W. and Q. M. Ibid.

the imitation of the famous Presbyterian Basson Dr. Bass-
wick, when he reviles the present Clergy of the Church of
Scotland. P. 4

his impudence in charging the Archbishop of Glasgow with
so many unheard of Crimes. P. 5

his Vanity in thinking that his Books do greater Facts than
the other Scriblings of his Party. P. 6

his Civilities to the Clergy of the Church of England; and
his particular Forgeries against the Author of the Apology. Ibid.

his Critical Skill examin'd. And his officious interposal in
the Defence of Mr. Rule further Chastis'd. Ibid.

A train of many important Lies sagester against Dr. Monte-
lupus. P. 7

his stupid ignorance in the History of the first Reformation of
Scotland; and in the Doctrine of the first Reformers. P. 8

The Contents.

<i>His Feeble attempts to prove the Divine Right of Presbytery</i>	Ibid.
<i>His abominable Lies in charging the Government with unheard of Cruelties</i>	p. 9
<i>The Cameronians prov'd to be the most zealous Presbyterians.</i>	
<i>And Mr. Ridpath's Argument against their Authority, prov'd from Presbyterian Principles to be no Argument at all</i>	Ibid.
<i>His Argumentum ad hominem from the Viscount of Dundee's Practices proves no more than that he is ignorant in the first Elements of Logick</i>	p. 10
<i>His comparison between the Practices of the Church of England, and those of the Scotch Presbyterians; scandalous and impertinent</i>	Ibid.
<i>Presbyterians more cruel and barbarous than any other People.</i>	
<i>This prov'd by a memorable instance in the year 1643</i>	p. 11
<i>The Covenanters less skilful than the Inquisitors; but equally Cruel</i>	p. 11
<i>His ignorance further expos'd</i>	p. 12
<i>The Dr. us'd no Equivocation when he said, that the Covenant was rigorously impos'd upon Children</i>	Ibid.
<i>This prov'd by an Act of the Gen. Ass. 1648.</i>	p. 13
<i>The Charge of Equivocation disprov'd and retorted</i>	p. 14, 15
<i>The Practice of the Episcopal Clergy in exposing the Presbyterians, vindicated from Levity and Profaniry</i>	Ibid.
<i>The Cameronians the most active, and the most consequential Presbyterians</i>	p. 16
<i>His derivation of the Word Butchery, compar'd with such another Critical Essay of a Beilman</i>	Ibid.
<i>The Acts of the General Assembly, especially those of 48, and 49, do sufficiently vindicate K. Ch. 2. from all imputations of rigor and cruelty</i>	p. 17
<i>Sir George Mackenzie gave a true Narrative of the first Rise and Occasion of those Laws that the Presbyterians complain of</i>	p. 18
<i>One of the Pleading Scribes in favours of Presbytery, his weakness</i>	(5)

The Contents.

weakness, silliness and ignorance, fairly expos'd in some Particulars	p. 18, 19
Mr. Ridpath's Lies, viz. that Sir Geo. Mackenzie persecuted Hamilton of Hallside, refused by Hallside himself	Ibid.
No Laws made against Presbyterians as such, but against Seditions, Tumults, and Insurrections	Ibid.
His method of answering Arguments by suppressing such Words, upon which their strength depends	p. 19, 20
The Presbyterians in general charg'd with Rebellious Principles and Practices. This made good against the whiffling exceptions and evasions of Mr. Ridpath	p. 21
The King and Parliament did not consider them as Presbyterians, but as stubborn and incorrigible Rebels	Ibid.
The Majority of the People for the Episcopal Clergy	Ibid.
His rude and inconsiderable Lie against the Earl of Airly, and the Laird of Meldrum	p. 22
The Doctrine of Passive Obedience fairly stated and defended	Ibid.
The Presbyterian Exceptions disprov'd and retorted	p. 23, 24
Mr. Ridpath's incurable infelicity in mistaking true Sense for Contradictions	Ibid.
The Writings of Mr. Rutherford prov'd obscure, and Mr. Ridpath invited to defend them	p. 25, 26
Mr. Ridpath's impudence in denying the Blasphemies that are to be seen in Mr. Rule's Books	p. 26, 27
His blustering ignorance further expos'd	p. 28
The Presbyterians prov'd to be the first aggressors in the Trade of Libelling, and the only experienced Practitioners	p. 28, 29, 30
The additional accusations against Dr. Monro proves no more than Mr. Ridpath's wickedness and malice	p. 30, 31
The Murder of Archbishop Sharp prov'd to be the result of Presbyterian Principles	p. 32
The Presbyterians by their Principles not oblig'd to Form	p. 33
The Charge of Pedantry brought against the Doctor disprov'd and retorted	p. 33, 34, 35
Our Ecclesiastical Superiors did not connive at the Faults of the	Subor-

The Contents.

Subordinate Clergy, who they proceeded against such as were complain'd of by the Orderly and tedious Methods of the Law	P. 31
Mr. Ridpath further chas'tis'd for his ignorance in the History and Principles of the Presbyterians	P. 33, 36
His ungovernable Malice against Dr. Canaries in many rude and impertinent efforts	P. 37
His wilful and affected mistake of the Author of the Post-scrip's meaning	P. 38
His ignorance of a formal Contradiction	P. 39
The Presbyterians accuse all Men of plotting against the Government, because plotting is their only Element	P. 40
Mr. Ridpath's Hypocrisie, wishing that both Parties may be tender of one another, when his Practice in the next Line confutes all his pretences of Piety	Ibid.
His common Topick to justify his Calumnies, viz. That he does not know what he writes to be false, further exposed and ridicul'd	Ibid.
His Ignorance in opposing the knowledge of Arms to the Liberal Arts and Sciences	P. 41, 42
The charge against the Clergy of Stealing their Sermons reversed upon an Impudent Presbyterian Plagiarist	P. 43, 44
His Vanity and Ignorance further Chas'tis'd	P. 44
His affectation of Theology, Logick and Wit, exposed by plain and palpable instances	P. 45, 46
His Catalogue of Cruelties and Treacheries parallel'd	P. 47, 48
Another Objection against the Bishops of Scotland consider'd	P. 49
Several Certificates and Letters in favours of the Calumniated Clergy	P. 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66
Several Propositions extracted out of the Presbyterian Books	P. 68, 69, 70, 71
Mr. James Mitchel the famous Assassin his Letter, Justifying from Scripture his Villanous attempt to Murder the Archbishop of St. Andrews	P. 72

[1]

Mr. Ridpath,

I Have good information from several Persons of known integrity here at *London*, that you are the Author of two abusive Pamphlets by which you endeavour to defame our Kings, Parliaments, and Nobles, such as we had in *Scotland* before the *Revolution*. Our Kings were perjured Tyrants, and K. *Charles II.* knew that he himself had forfeited his Title to the Crown *. Our Parliaments were but pack'd * *Contriv'd* a company of slavish Parasites, that contributed all they could to *ruin* the ruin of our Liberties, Civil and Religious; and consequently our Nobility can deserve no better Character, who made to great a Figure in all our Parliaments. As for the Episcopal Clergy whether Bishops or Presbyters, you give them so many names, that it is a wonder you did not think such a despicable company of men below your Notice.

The Book which you call your *Continuation*, most of it is levelled against one particular man; and when I undertake his Defence (if that be necessary) I find that the reading over your book, and transcribing so many parts of it was all the toil I was likely to undergo, and tho you call him whom you fancy to be your Adversary a man of *ungovernable passion*; yet I must tell you that he could not but be mad to the last degree, if he were angry at the names you give him, since they of the first quality in *Europe*, have no fairer quarter at your hands; *A Scribler, a Pedant, a Hawker, a Villain, an Ass, an Ignoramus, a Blunderer*, are all of them words that he can bear with patience, when his Superiours are not better treated. One may modestly conclude that you are very angry, and that's a greater punishment than any of your Adversaries can inflict upon you. The Author of the *Postscript to the Apology for the Clergy of Scotland*, told you already, that he was not at all concerned in that scuffle between you and your Antagonist, nor is he likely to offer his mediation to end your Debate; and he is still of the opinion, that he can employ his time better than to read again your *Answer*, or the Book that occasioned it. His *Postscript* is a short Epistolary account of the first, or rather a Character of the present methods of *Presbytery*, in imitation of their Predecessors, than any particular view of your Book, and I am content that you impute this to his ignorance or weakness or what else you please to call it. It is very odd that you should think that you have power to summon any body to the Press when you please, even when you lurk behind the Curtains. You

take it for granted that Dr. M-- was the Author of that *Postscript*, and it may be you hit right enough; yet tho your Party be lashed in it with some severity, he takes no great pleasure in meddling with particular men further than necessity constrains.

He said, that there was not a *good consequence in your Book from the beginning to the end*; this could not but provoke a man of your courage and mettle. By a *Consequence*, I humbly think he understood a truth deduced from true and solid Principles that overthrows the common cause of Episcopacy, or the reputation of those men whom you asperse, I mean such of the Clergy who were never under any publick censure of the Church. He told you likewise that he had no inclination particularly to examine the imaginary contradictions that you charge your Enemy with, and now I give you the reason, partly because the Theme, as you manage it, yields no edification, partly because the publick is not at all concerned to read such Libels and altercations, and he gives you liberty to triumph as much as you please upon this Head: but if your honour and credit is at stake, and that you find your self concerned more particularly to run him down than any other, he is content to meet you before any competent number of grave witnesses, who by their authority may mitigate such excursions of rudeness as may be feared, if your blood should boil to its usual fervor: and to reason the matter calmly, and (without either huffing, or the terrible language of an Almanzor) to demonstrate that there is not a *good consequence in your Book from the beginning to the end*. And indeed you may excuse me to tell you, that in your last Pamphlet you seem not to understand the very first Elements of Logick.

Moreover, the Author of the *Postscript* incur'd your high displeasure, by saying, that there were abusive Metaphors in Mr. Rutherford's Letters, and some dark and unintelligible passages in his Scholastical Essays: and is this the unpardonable Crime for which there can be no atonement? Mr. Kidpath, this was no reflection upon his Morals, but a plain matter of Fact to be seen by every body that peruseth the Books that are cited. And therefore this could not at all justify your accusing Sir George Mackenzie to have suborned Witnesses; a practice so infamous and so wicked, that I am confident no man of honour will ever say any such thing of the truly *Just, and Learned Advocate*. A previous examination of Witnesses in criminal Cases is not Subornation, but precognition, practised at all times in Scotland before they deposed judicially; and Sir George Mackenzie wanted not many clear evidences to prove that C. of C. was plotting an insurrection against the King and Government about the time of Argyle's rebellion. You may read the elegant History of that insur-

rection

rection written by the * *Bishop of Rochester*, and there you may see with your own Eyes several authentick Evidences, upon record, against C. of C. and I must tell you that Sir *George Mackenzie* needed not that Gentleman's Assistance to re commend him to the present Court, if he had been ambitious to have been a Favorite; and if he told C. of C. that he had done him an Injury, and begg'd him pardon, how came this Confession to be made publick? if he to whom it was first revealed, under trust, spread it abroad, he is guilty of something that no Gentleman will readily own; but the plain truth is Sir *George Mackenzie* never told him any such thing, after the manner you represent it; and he had very good reason to expect that the Witnesses against C. of C. would judiciously depone in publick, the very same things that they asserted in private; and if you please you may remember that there is a greater difference between Sir *George Mackenzie* and your self, than between Mr. *Rutherford* and those of our Clergy you trample upon.

Your Advice and Threatnings to the Ministers of State in England are idle, and of no use at all; for Ministers of State will advise according to their Light and Conviction, without any regard to the short-liv'd Pamphlets that fly about the City; nor are they likely to receive their Measures either from you, or any of us who see so little in their Sphere. The *Presbyterians* in England are not yet ripe for a Rebellion, and they in Scotland can do little to disturb England, without their Assistance, and therefore you had best forbear your Threatnings, for I am apt to think that your Influence in either Nation goes but a little way.

You treat King *William* no better than other Kings, since, you say, he is prevailed upon to write Letters to the General Assembly that they are not obliged in Law to comply with; but better Lawyers are of another Opinion, and if King *William* venture upon such Essays of Arbitrary Power, in a little time (according to your Hypothesis) he may forfeit his Title, since he has none but such as is twisted with the Divine Right of *Presbytery*. But indeed, Mr. *Redpath*, I shank we had Kings in Scotland, before we had either *Covenants*, or *Presbytery*, or the Claim of *Right*; and that our fundamental Constitution does not depend upon an Act of the General Assembly, tho' the General Assembly sometimes venture, in terms, to make an Act against an Act of Parliament.

It is a gentle Compliment that you bestow upon Queen *Mary*, when you allow the *Jacobites* to invite her Father to keep the *Solemn Feast* in the *Basil*; and I think none is permitted to speak so but

* A true Account of the horrid Conspiracy against the King, &c. printed by Tho. Newcomb. Edit. 2. 1685.

Mr. Ridpath. It is not safe for any Government to suffer Buffoons to treat crowned Heads so familiarly; whatever be the Quarrel between Princes, this Language is intolerable; yet some Animals are privileged to bark at this rate. *The Clazomenians*, coming to *Sparta*, sullied the Thrones on which the *Ephori* sat; when the *Ephori* came to know this Indignity, they bore it patiently, and called for a publick Herald, and ordered him to proclaim through the City, that it was lawful for the *Clazomenians* to do things that were unbecoming and undecent, that is to say, such barbarous Rascals were below Reproof and Revenge.

Dr. Paterson. Two of our *Archbishops* you treat in the same Language that *son, Dr. Dr. Basswick*, the famous *Presbyterian* Buffoon, used towards the *Arch- Cameross.* *bishop* of *Canterbury* and his *Colleagues*, when he tells them that the *Hierarchy* came from the Pope and the Devil, *Diabolus cecavit illos*; *Nalf. Coll.* *They* forsooth must be called *Magnates Ecclesie*, and the *Merit* of the *1 Vol. pag.* matter is, *They are Magnæ Nates Ecclesie*. It is odious to transcribe *499. Vid.* his Civilities to *Archbishop Laud*, and his *Venerable Brethren*, and *p. 500, &* therefore I refer you to the Book cited in the Margin: only there is *501.* one of his Complements which I set down, because it had in it the mean and scurrillous Spirit of the Party; which you copy so exactly *Ib. p. 503.* that one would have thought *Dr. Basswick* had been your Father; thus *Ib. p. 502.* he goes on (speaking of the Priests of the Church of *England*). *They* are *secundum Ordinem Diaboli*, a Generation of *Vipers*, proud, ungrateful, illiterate *Afles*: the Church is as full of Ceremonies as a Dog is full of Fleas. And again, One would think that Hell were broke loose, and that the Devils in Surplices, in Hoods, in Capes, and Robets, and in four-squared Corn-turds upon their Heads, were come among us, and had beset us all. *Pbo!* how they sink! This is the Wit and Civility of an enraged *Presbyterian*; these are the Flights of a Zealot, when inspired to the height. You treat *Archbishop Sharp* and the *Archbishop of Glasgow*, in the same Language that *Archbishop Laud*, and *Archbishop Spotswood*, were complemented by your Predecessors.

There is a Letter here, which I have seen, from the *Archbishop of Glasgow* to one of his Friends; which, some time or other may see the light in a larger Treatise. It was occasioned by your obscene Libels against him; I must tell you one thing that is in it, and it may provoke your Curiosity to see it. He promises two hundred pound sterling to any Man that will prove, by Witnesses of known Probity, any one Particular that is maliciously vented against him by your self or any of your Informers. Why then do not ye appear openly above-board, for the *Bishop* declines no competent Judge in *Scotland*? 'Tis true, He thought that the Book that treated him so barbarously, had been

been writ by some of the fluttering *Damns* about the City, whose most compendious Method to destroy Religion, is at any rate, to run down the Clergy; but if he had known his Accuser, 'tis more than probable he would forbear any Vindication. He was sometimes opposed by Persons of the first Quality in the Nation, and if he had been so wicked a Wretch as you represent him, he had certainly forfeited his Life to Justice; and his Name to Infamy, as he expresses it himself in his Letter. Mr. Ridpath, do not take it ill that I do not go through the Particulars of your Libel against the Bishop, for I have made you a fair Offer already; and besides, when you are better informed, you will find your self that you name some Persons in your Libel, who are lasting Monuments of the Disgrace of your Faction; so that you have as little of the *Wisdom of the Serpent*, as of the *Innocence of the Dove*. You may go on and accuse the Bishop and his Collegues of all the Crimes that your Predecessors charged the former Bishops with, in the year 1638; nay, which is more, you may accuse him of all the Villanies which your own Major *Wier* actually committed, when he ran about with so many of the Sisters, from one Communion to another; and I assure you that neither he nor any of his Friends will take notice of you. We know very well that you are at extraordinary pains to gather Intelligence against the Clergy, but all your Evidences hitherto are of no Authority at all.

You think that if Mr. Rule's Book provoked the Author of the Postscript to *Undecencies of Passion*, the reading of yours would make him *stark mad*. Not so, Mr. Ridpath, we may sometimes get a more deadly Wound by an Arrow that flies near the Earth, than by the Thunder that goes over our Heads. He begins, you say, with downright Nonsense and a notorious Lie; but one and the same Proposition cannot be both Nonsense and a Lie; one cannot tell what to make of the first, and therefore it is neither a Lie nor a Truth: he continues still in the same Opinion, that the Principles and Practices of the *Covenanters* occasioned the Laws that you complain of, whether you mean their Practices from the Year 1637, to the Year 1650; or their Behaviour after the Restoration of King Charles II, all is one to me; they overthrew the Monarchy under King Charles I, disturbed it by frequent Insurrections under King Charles II, and are ready to do so still, if at any time their boundless Tyranny and Ambition be restrained.

The rest of that Paragraph is a Declamation against *Prelacy*, and pag. 12. the Clergy of *England* must be lashed with the same Severity, where-with you chastise those of *Scotland*; and in your first Book you represent those of *England* as a Company of treacherous Prevaricators: Anf. Scot.

that *Elog.* p. 4.

that the Crown set them up by a daring Perjury, and that the same Party hath thrust that Family from the Throne, by a Copy exactly answering the Original. They are obliged very much to your Civilities, if the Family be thrust from the Throne, you are the Author of a new Discovery; but I leave this to their consideration who are more concerned.

Page 14.

You are diffident of your Arguments against the Author of the Postscript, and therefore you will take more effectual and compendious methods to ruin him: for you tell us that upon the taking of *Namur*, he was heard in St. James's Park to salute Mr. *Shields* by the title of a *Bishop*, no doubt in view of a *Revolution* which was likely to follow. There is one thing that I thank you heartily for, viz. that this accusation is express, particular, and circumstantiated, for when accusations are loose, general, and indefinite, nothing can be fixt upon that can lead us unto the Truth, and therefore Mr. *Ridpath*, here I plainly give you the Lye; I know a man of your honour will resent this affront. The affirmative part is your own, and therefore common sense obliges you to prove it if you can; you are here upon the place, so are they whom you accuse; the Dr. declines no competent Judge in *England*, and if you can prove that ever he spoke with Mr. *Shields* in St. James's Park, he'll acknowledge all the Libels against him to be true, and the only method to save your Reputation in this particular, is to put it to a fair Trial. But I perceive that you are as unfortunate in the informations that you receive against the Clergy, as you are hasty and unadvised in publishing of them.

Ibid.

Whether the error in *Scotch Grammar* with which you charge the Dr. be an omission of the Printer or his inadvertence, is not material to enquire, he had rather commit a thousand such, than one Latin *Solecism* in a publick Harangue *ex Cathedra*. It is uneasy to live next door to a Grammarian. Read over again the 2d. page of your *Constitution*, LXXI. or the 5th. p. of your Preface, l. 30. and tell me if it be exact Grammar. It is impudence beyond comparison, to say, that the Dr. charged Mr. *Rule* falsely with speaking wrong *Latin*; 'tis a wonder to me, why he himself or any of his Friends should be so zealous to defend him upon that Head, and if you would be so wise as to let those stories alone, I know none would be so idle as to revive them; and because you will not suffer us to forget his *Latine*, I will give you one instance more of the purity of his Style. Asking one of the Students what was his Name, the Youth told him so and so, but not adding his Surname; He asked again, *quid est vestrum nomen?* At another time missing the Key of a certain Box which is kept in the Library, when he would have opened it, he told them that were about him, *Nescio quid factum est de his, habui mon.* Now the Affirmative is mine,

I am obliged to prove it when ever you put me to it. You are all of you so tender upon the point of Honour, that you let nothing pass without present Revenge, and Mr. Rule himself may know the Witnesses when he pleases, tho' it be not decent to print their Names.

The next accusation against the Dr. is, that he cannot forbear Swearing. Mr. Ridpath, I hope it is otherwise; and this is but an Article of the original Libel, answered already in the *Presbyterian Inquisition*. You was advised by the Author of the Postscript, rather to insist on the old Libel than to trust to your own invention. Moreover you say that it can be proved, that he said to a certain Minister, that if the Episcopal party had not the Government, he cared not if the Devil had it. By other accusers this Calumny is otherwise represented, viz. that if the Episcopal party had not the Government, he cared not if the Papists had it; but both are beat out upon the same Anvil. I wish you had named the Minister to whom this was said; the Devil has but too much of the Government of the World already, and I am afraid that they who publish such malicious and indefinite reports, are more governed by him than they are aware of.

You charge him again, that he hindered the printing of Mr. James's Book, against *Quakerism*; he had no authority to do so, nor was it possible for him to treat Mr. Jameson with greater civility than he did. As for the Oath imposed on the Scholars in King James's time, that is sufficiently accounted for in another *Treatise*, and whether you are satisfied or not, it matters not much. The Objections started against it, were but the Whimfies of a malicious Pedant who knew not well what he said.

It must be confessed that He preferred the *French Refugees* to the *Scotch Presbyterians*, when both petitioned the *Town-Council* for the use of the *publick Hall* to preach in upon the Sundays: I am not obliged to believe, upon your authority, that he had any indecent expressions upon that occasion. I incline to think that if the *Presbyterians* had the *publick Hall* of the *College*, very many naughty persons would resort unto it, though the *Presbyterian* Ministers should endeavour to hinder it. Now I would gladly ask you one Question, whether ever you had a Scholar, that answered you with greater submission and obedience than I do.

You name a Person at the foot of the 15 pag. whom you say, the Dr. was careful to vindicate, that he never so much as mentioned his Name; but Newfashioners have a greater priviledge than their Neighbours.

* This is glanced at in a late Letter written by a *Presbyterian* Minister to a member of Parliament, p. Vi.

P. 15.

* *Presb. Inquisition.*

pag. 16.

It is certain that the Scheme of the Presbyterian Religion, as far as they differ from the Episcopalians, is nothing else but ungovernable Humour and Rebellion. Now is it necessary to strike off the Doctor's Head for this one Expression. The Presbyterian Opinions, as such, are new and lately started, and peculiar to themselves, nor is there any of the Reformed Churches that ever asserted Presbyterian government to be founded upon such Divine Right as is exclusive of all other Ecclesiastical Politics. The Church of Scotland, which, you say, was Presbyterian from the beginning of the Reformation, declares positively, in her Confession of Faith, that Church Polity is variable, and the Order of Bishops was never condemned by our Reformers; and Buchanan tells us expressly, that our first Reformers were so far from being Presbyterians, that *Scoti ante aliquot annos Anglorum auxilium & servitutem Gallica liberati Religionis cultui & ritibus cum Anglis communibus subscripserunt.*

Buchan.
Hist. lib.
19.


To say that the Church of Scotland should be governed by Presbytery, because Presbyters were most active in the first Reformation, is an unpardonable Impertinence. If all the Bishops in the Church of Scotland had been as zealous to promote the Reformation as the Bishops of Galloway and Argyle, would it therefore follow, that if the Bishops had reformed the Church without the assistance of Presbyters, there ought to be no Presbyters in the Church when it was fully reformed. No, I think this could not follow; and therefore when the Bishops own the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, they must be obeyed, and our Reformers never declaimed against their Order; and if they would adhere to the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, Calvin determines positively in that Case, that *nullo non anathemate*

Calvin. Inst. lib. 4. *digni sunt*, who stubbornly oppose their Authority; but we had no such thing as Presbytery in Scotland, settled by Authority in all its Pretences, until the Rebellion broke out in the Year 1638. Presbyterians, we had, Tumults, Combinations and Factions in abundance, and Interruptions of the legal Government, and Parliamentary Concessions to pacify the Faction; but a total abolishing of the Order of Bishops, before the Rebellion in King Charles I. his time, was never heard, and to say otherwise

Vid. Nalf. contradicts the Series of all our Records. If the places of Scripture that you cite, prove that the names of those Clergy-men that were above Deacons were not distinguished; yet this cannot infer an Equality among them, for the Apostles themselves were called sometimes Presbyters, and the Church was never governed by a perfect Equality of Presbyters. The Ecclesiastical Senate had

And again, Lib. A. c.
10. § 6. Sane si veri
Episcopi essent, aliquid
eis in hac parte aucto-
ritatis tribuerem, non
quantum sibi postulant,
sed quantum ad Politi-
am Ecclesie ritè ordi-
nandam requirunt.

Coll. 1. Pol.
and the K's
large Ma-
nifesto.

had its constant *Præses*, without whose Authority nothing of any moment was transacted. How often do you meet, in the *Old Testament*, the Jewish Clergy *disbatomized* into *Priests* and *Levites*? Will it therefore follow, that there was no *High-priest* among them to govern the whole Society? you seem to have no other Notion of a *Presbyter* than what you meet with in your late Pamphlets; but it was an honourable *Appellation*, bestowed, in the Apostolick times upon all Orders of Ecclesiasticks above a *Deacon*. Let us know where this Superiority and Jurisdiction of one *Presbyter* above another is forbidden. It was established by God himself in the *Old Testament*, let us see it repealed in the *New*. I think we may leave this Dispute to other Combatants, who may have occasion to discourse of it more fully, when the Mortar-pieces are shot that you threaten us with. Only be mindful to let us see those Epistles of St. *Augustine* to St. *Jerom*, wherein you say that *Episcopacy* is proved to be of humane Appointment. 

Your next contains a lamentable Catalogue of Cruelties that you say the *Presbyterians* in the West did undergo under the former Reigns, viz. that some were roasted before Fires, &c. I thank God I never heard any such thing before, and if it had been true all *Christianity* would have heard of it, and tho you had the Authority of the General Assembly to vouch it, you must excuse me if I continue in my former Unbelief. pag. 17.

All your Bauble about the *Cameronians* is neither to your Purpose pag. 18. nor mine, their Practices can never be condemned by *Presbyterian* Principles, and they may be the Standard of *Presbytery* as much as the Ministers you name in that Paragraph. The *Protesters* were not so numerous as the *Resolutioners*, yet you must acknowledge they were the only orthodox *Presbyterians*; for the *Resolutioners* were rotten-hearted Malignants, and the *Protesters* are the present visible Church of the *Presbyterians*; and if they had stood upon the Plurality of Votes, they had yielded to the General Assembly against whom they protested. And this is the fatal and fundamental Error of your Party, that they have no principles of Unity, but such as a plausible Protestation seconded by the Rabble can shake your Ecclesiastical Authority upon all occasions, according to the Original Maxim of Mr. *Andrew Melvil*, *Vota sunt ponderanda, non numeranda*.

Your *Argumentum ad hominem* taken from the *Viscount of Dundee's* Practices, proves no more than your thick and palpable Ignorance in the first Principles of *Logic*. Nothing can be improved as an *Argumentum ad hominem* against any Man, but such Practices as naturally overthrow his own Principles; and do you think that my Lord *Dundee* owned any true and indisputable Right in them against whom he fought?

and if upon *this Hypothesis* there was no Title, pray what becomes of your *Argumentum ad hominem*? My humble Advice is, that some one or other of your Friends may teach you the *Pocahontas* *Artis*, before you write so magisterially: and you'll find this to be but a friendly Advice before I have done with you, and whatever Proficiency you have made in *Grammar*, your *Logicks* are but of about two Months standing.

Your Parallel between the Practices of the *Church of England* towards King *James* and those of the *Scottish Presbyterians* towards King *Charles II.* is a true Specimen of your Skill. We know no such Practices of the *Church of England*, nor are we to learn her Doctrines from Scurrilous Pamphlets, but from her *Articles*, *Homilies*, *Liturgy*, and *Canons*.

That the *Presbyterian Cruelty* towards the *Episcopalians* after the Year 1647, were unparallel'd in *History*, remains still a Truth, because they suffered from Men who declared themselves to be of the same Religion with their Neighbours; the Cruelties of *Papists* towards *Protestants*, and of *Infidels* towards *Christians*, and of *Pagans* towards them who worship one God, cannot make up an exact parallel, because the Rebels by whom our people were persecuted, pretended to be of the same Communion. But since you name the *Massacre at*

Pag. 19.

Paris, you may call to mind that in the Year 1645, the *Presbyterians* under the Command of General *Leslie*, cut in pieces some hundreds of the *Marquess of Montrose's* *Infantry*, in cold blood, after quarter given; when the *Marquess* was betrayed, and that he was forc'd to retire, a considerable body of his Army surrendered their Arms upon *Articles*, and stood, as they were directed by the *Covenanters*, in a plain open Field, having nothing to defend themselves with but their Nails; then it was time for the *Presbyterians* to discover their true Intentions, and to let the world see that no Promises, no Capitulations could bind up the hands of *Covenanters*, when it was in their power to do Mischief, and you are to remember that this horrid Tragedy was acted at the special Instigation of the *Woolly Ministers* in the

Vid. Hist.
Obl. MSS.
by Gurb.

Army, for *Souldiers* know no such Villanies. But the *Enthusiastick* Zealot who preached, thought that the Blood of so many innocent people was a good beginning of a thorough Reformation. He chose his Text 1 Sam. 15. 14. *What meaneth then this bleating*, &c. insinuating that they could not be said to obey God, as long as they left any alive that were not *Covenanters*, and when General *Leslie*, contrary to his own Inclination, Honour, and Authority, yielded to their Fury, he asked this *Sanguinary Enthusiast*, *Was John the son of Bartheolomew now?* Compare all Circumstances, and match this in *History* if you can; not to mention now the throwing so many Women and Children

Montrose
def. at Phil-
isburgh.

drawn

aren over the Bridge of *Lisbow*, without either Form or Process, for no other Crime, but that they followed their Husbands and Relations to *Montrose* his Army. And the former instance is by so much the more remarkable that the poor people who were murdered in cold blood, contrary to the Laws of Nations, the faith of mankind, and the ancient honour of the *Scots*, were all of them Protestants, and laid down their Arms upon capitulation for their full freedom and safety: to embrew their hands in the blood of their Countrymen, contrary to the solemnity of Promises, was a thing that could only be acted by *Covenanters*; so that your instances of the *Adassacre* at *Paris*, and the Duke of *Alva's* butchery in the *Netherlands*, are indeed sad abuses of Supreme Authority, and lasting Monuments of cruelty: but that which I just now named, adds to cruelty perfidious treachery, such as blows up the foundations of humane Society.

But Mr. *Ridpath*, you ask, if ever you put the Prelatists in *Dungeons* he eaten up of Toads and Serpents, and if not, you think you may conclude that you fall short of the cruelty of the *Inquisition*. I answer, whether there are Toads and Serpents in the lower Vaults of the *Talbooth* of *Edinburg*, I cannot tell, but I am very sure the Reverend Bishop *Wisebeers* was almost eaten up of Vermin in that Dungeon, and bore the marks of the *Covenanters* cruelty, as well as the evidences of his own invincible patience to his dying hour; and if your *Covenanters* at that time were not so ingenious in inventing instruments of bodily torture as the *Fathers* of the *Inquisition* were, yet you cannot deny but that they were equally fierce and bloody: the *Presbyterians* were only acted by a lower order of *Demons*, who had not so much light and art, (yet altogether as furious and as opposite to true goodness) as those by whom the *Inquisition* were guided.

But you think that though the Dr's Conscience be prostituted to a Prodigy, yet it flies in his face, when such and such things are said of the *Covenanters*. Mr. *Ridpath*, I am now pretty well acquainted with this Noise, and you see that I meet your loudest Thunder without any disturbance, and all that I return to this Civility is no more, than to advise you to distinguish between a little fluttering Rhetorick and common Sense; when ones Conscience is prostituted, as you say, to a Prodigy, he feels no remorse at all; and therefore his Conscience cannot fly in his face, 'tis feared with a hot Iron, he is proof against all light and conviction, altogether blinded and stupified under the power of his Error. And

Ibid.

if the Dr's Conscience fly in his face, he is still within the possibilities of being recovered, but you must treat him a little more softly if you intend to make him a Profelyte.

Ibid.

But you tell us next, that the Dr. learnt the *art of Equivocation* as well as if he had been at Rome; for he says, that the *Covenant* was rigorously imposed upon all, Children at the Schools not excepted. To this you answer, that you believe it was required of little Children that offered to take the degree of *Masters of Art* about the age of thirty years, and then you hoise all your Sails, and leave the poor Dr. exposed to all the contempt that a silly Sophister deserves. Now Mr. *Ridpath*, we are again closely engaged; and if I do not get the Dr. out of this mire, I must run for it. If you was your self near thirty years old when you went to the University, as you seem to insinuate, one might reasonably presume, that your blood had been colder before now; and that you would not vapour at this rate, when you had no reserve to defend you, but your ignorance in a plain matter of Fact; and therefore all that know *Scotland*, know very well, that the Children in our Country ordinarily go to the University at the age of twelve, thirteen, or fourteen years; and such may in the strictest sense be called *Children*, and of such it was required to take the *Covenant*: for my part I never knew one amongst them that arrived to the age of thirty before he received his degrees. There was no Equivocation in the case, when the Author of the *Postscript* told you, that the *Covenant* was imposed upon Children at the Schools, for he meant it of no other Children than those younger ones who entered the University, and who were not allowed to delay their swearing the *Covenant* until they left it, but were forced as soon as they entred, to take it upon implicate Faith; if this is made evident, you must acknowledg that there was no *Equivocation* used by the Author of the *Postscript*. If you set up for a Patron of *Presbyterian* practices, and must needs hector the World into a belief of your blustering Romances, if you intend to be successful, you ought to read more and write less; and because the *Affirmative* is now mine, I am obliged to prove it, and if you desire better proof, I'll make you amends; it is the following Act of the *General Assembly*.

Act for taking the Covenant at the first receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and for the taking of it also by all Students at the first entry to Colleges.

Gen. Ass.
1648. p.
mibi 44.
printed by
Ev. Tyler,
Edinb.
An. 1648.

THE General Assembly according to former recommendations doth ordain, that all Young Students take the Covenant at their first Entry to Colleges, and that hereafter all Persons whatsoever take the Covenant at their first receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. Requiring hereby provincial Assemblies, Presbyteries and Universities to be careful that this Act be observed, and account thereof taken in the Visitation of Universities, and particular Kirks, in the trial of Presbyteries.

Now Mr. Ridpath, I hope you are satisfied, that by Children were meant those young ones who are but newly come from Country Schools.

The word *Equivocation* brings to my mind some practices of the Presbyterians, still upon Record; I mean publick and Solemn Deeds, which seem to justify *Equivocation*, if it be for the glory of God, i. e. if it promote the ends of the Covenant. It is nothing to see you or me *equivocate*; these are the failings of us two private, obscure, and particular Persons, but to see the General Assembly, the true and only supreme Representative of the Kirk of Scotland, shift, double, and equivocate, is treachery and hypocrisy, with a witness. To make you sensible of this, you are to remember as an introduction to what follows, that the Covenanters who went to *Aberdeen* to recommend the Covenant to the Clergy and Professors of Divinity there, told them, that notwithstanding they should swear the Covenant, yet they were left at liberty to Vote for *Episcopacy* when the General Assembly met; but when the General Assembly met, they concluded *prima instantia*, that *Episcopacy* was abjured in the Covenant: This prevarication is complained of by the Marquess of Hamilton, His Majesties Commissioner, in a printed Declaration, Anno 1639. To this they Nals Hist answer, that they did not expressly and Specifice abjure *Episcopacy*, Col. 1. Vol. but p. 128.

An. 1638.

but only generally and virtually, by abjuring whatsoever was abjured in the Confession 1580. Now the meaning of this is, by their Covenant they abjured Episcopacy *virtually*, but not *specifically*. But how could the Members of the Assembly be left at liberty to vote freely for Episcopacy after they took the Covenant, if Episcopacy was *virtually* and generally abjured in the Covenant? this is as much to say, as, tho I am obliged by the Christian Religion *virtually* and generally against all degrees of Theft, yet I am not obliged *specifically* by my Baptismal Vow against picking a Man's Pocket of his Watch. What a juggle was it to say, that Men might vote freely for that Government which was, for the matter, abjured? These are the Metaphysical Lectures that are to be learned in Presbyterian Schools, who think nothing to dally with Mens Consciences, by the juggle of a distinction, which, at bottom, is but Hypocrisy and Impertinence.

V. King's large Manifesto. & Nal. Hist. Coll. 1 vol. pag. 151. But would you have another sample of their *Casistical Theology*? read what follows, in their Answer to the third Reason, *Albeit by the meaning of the Prescriber of an Oath, the Swearer were tacitly bound to maintain Episcopacy, five Articles of Perth, and such like; yet according to the premittid Considerations he is more obliged to the reality rei jurata, which is now declared and found to abjure Episcopacy, & nor to the meaning of the Prescriber, or his own either, being contrary to the Explanation of the sovereign Judge competent.* Thus far the Covenanters.
 3 Reasons. pag. 152.
 + than.

Now Mr. Ridpath, name any one Proposition more knavish, hypocritical and damnable than this is, that the Swearer is neither bound to the meaning of the Imposer, nor to his own meaning who takes the Oath, but to the reality of the thing sworn, as it shall be afterwards explained by the competent Judge: which, in their meaning, was none else than the General Assembly. Did you ever read any thing worse in the *Casistical* Writings of the Jesuits? But it may be that your Curiosity reaches not so far as the moral Theology of Esopbar, Filiucius, or Emanuel Sa. Did ever the transcendent Power of Rome go higher? If Oaths neither oblige *sensu damis* nor *juramentis*, but in the sense of the Kirk, then we are obliged, without any further Enquiries, to submit our Necks to the infallible Decrees of the Assembly, tho we neither know what is in them, nor never intended to oblige our selves by them. I cite a very authentick Paper, bearing under the hand of Mr. Archibald Johnston, Clerk of the Assembly. So that the Mother Kirk can evacuate the force of all Oaths, Promises and Subscriptions, to the End of the World, for they do not oblige in the sense of the first Imposer, nor according

ding to the meaning of him that swore; but according to the
Commentary and Interpretation of the *General Assembly*; and for
the next *General Assembly* may pronounce, that by the Test (against
which they objected so many sad Stories) we are obliged to main-
tain and support Presbytery, tho' we swore it with quite contrary
Intentions; and indeed there is not any thing to be met amongst
the *Jesuits*; more, than five of all Religion and true Ministry;
than that memorable Position that I named from the *Atheistical*
Records of the *Conventicle*.

Some grave Men have been displeased that the Presbyterian
Fooleries have been exposed to laughter; and for my part I was
not of their Council who first assailed them in that manner, yet
those Gentlemen who accuse the *Episcopal* Clergy of *Sarabases*, as if
they had exposed Religion itself, by publishing some of the imperi-
cious and ridiculous *Parables* of Presbyterians, must consider, that
the learnedest and gravest *Divines*, in this as well as other Nations,
have treated Enthusiasts in no other manner. I have no room to
insert Monsieur *Paschal's* excellent Letter to the *Jesuits*, viz.

wherein he proves, from the Example of God himself, the *Theologie Mora-*
le des Jesuites, pag. 150. A Co-
lon *Sanctus Jesu Christi*; the Prophets, the *Figures* of
the Christian Church, and the holy Men of all Ages, *1666. En*
what it is ordinary, just and lawful, to ridicule such as *l'adice, nos Peres, il*
profane and pervert Religion by visionary and fanta- *vision de la difference*
stic Glosses, or such as deprave its Morals by loose and *entre eux de la Reli-*
scandalous Interpretations of God's most holy Lawd *gion, & dire de ceux*
Must we be said to laugh at Religion, if we smile when *qui se proposent par*
we hear a Man gravely telling us, that *les propositions extra-*
Lord of Chalken for Debt? No; we are as far removed *une impiete de man-*
from that profane humour, as the Commentary is from *quer de respect pour les*
the Gravity and Authority of the *Holy Scriptures*; *veriteuses l'esprit de*

one thing to laugh at Religion, and another thing to *l'esprit de l'esprit de*
laugh at them who profane it by their extravagant *l'esprit de l'esprit de*
piousness; and they ought to remember, that the *l'esprit de l'esprit de*
Deba treated them as familiar wags, as if *l'esprit de l'esprit de*
of our Party have done; nay the most leading Men *l'esprit de l'esprit de*

among the Presbyterians, in their most public Appearances had always
something or other to provoke the People to laughter; I instance
in Dr. *Burges's* Sermon before the House of Commons, 1640, the
first Motive by which he persuaded them to take the *Excommunication* was,
that *It will bring us to have a Court from all the Excommunication*,
expecting *the Excommunication* from him; *la Excommunication* from
him; *la Excommunication* from him; *la Excommunication* from him;
but the most foul a *Deba* with him, some
times with her Blood.

Mr.

* Nalf.
Hist. Coll.
1 vol. pag.
532..

Mr. Ridpath, you are very angry which we charge the Presbyterians with the odd and extravagant practices of the *Cameronians*, as if such things were disagreeable to their Sentiments: to tell you the truth, I think the *Cameronians* are the most active and ingenuous Subdivision of the Presbyterians; they are the Pioneers in your Camp, whom you hug and embrace as your dearest Brethren, when the roughest part of your Work is to be performed. Upon the late Revolution they drove the Clergy out of the West, and guarded the Convention, and many other considerable Services (they'll tell you themselves) they have done you; and yet forsooth they must not be allowed to be Presbyterians. The *Act* of the *West-Kirk*, and the *Remonstrance* in the Year 1650, are better Evidence of Presbyterian Principles, than all your idle whiffing Excuses and Evasions. Our People took care to publish an Epitome of the *Hind let loose*, not because it was written by any of the *Cameronians*; but rather because he that wrote it, gathered together the *Publick Papers, Remonstrances, Declarations, and Writings*, of that Party against the State, in which they lived since the Reformation; and therefore if any suffered hard things under the late Reigns, they were the high-flown Presbyterians; such of them as lived peaceably and modestly, suffered nothing at all; for our Laws never forbid any man to think but that Presbytery was preferable to Episcopacy, if his Opinions and Education led him to think so; but our Governours took care that the Principles of Presbyterians might not break out into Tumults and Insurrections; such as formerly pulled down the *Monarchy*, overthrew the Fundamental Constitution, and turned our Nation into a *Field of Blood*.

Pag. 23. We are very much obliged to your Wit and Invention for your Derivation of the word *Enthusiasm*; you prove us *Enthusiasts* from two Arguments, first because we are Drunkards, and next because we use unscriptural Ceremonies. I cannot deny but I was refreshed a little with this extraordinary Flight of your Fancy, and I leave it to all impartial Men to judge whether this *Whiffing* of yours, is another which I am going to tell you, be more coherent, rapacious and gentle; nay, I think I may leave it to your own decision, if you are but a little recovered from the career of your Passion: the Story is this, One of my Friends once persuaded me to go along with him to see that sad sight of *Bethlehem Hospital*; as we entered the lower Apartments, we drew near to the Cell of a little grave Man, whom we found reading *Ovid de Tristibus* with great Application. My Friend and I asked him several Questions, all which he answered very pertinently, so that we could not discover for a good while where

his Madneſſe ſay: at laſt I aſked him if he underſtood the Book he read, he told me he did, and convinced me that what he ſaid was true. I aſked him again, how he came to have ſuch a kindneſſe for that Book beyond other Books; at which he ſmiled with ſome appearance of Diſdain, plying my Ignorance, that I did not know a thing that he thought was known all the World over: why (ſaid he) *Ovid* is of our Family; and do not you know, (ſaid he) that *Ovidius* is from *Ovis* a Sheep, and the Butchers take *Ovis* by the Neck, and therefore he began his Book *de Triſtibus*, with *Parve nec invidia*; from all this he concluded that *Ovid* was of his Family; and, I think, he argued as wiſely as you do to prove us *Enthusiaſts*.

It is true, the Author of the Poſtſcript ſaid, that the *Acts of the General Aſſembly* did ſufficiently vindicate King Charles II. and his Miniſters of State from any Shadow of Rigour or Cruelty; but I muſt tell you that he meant other Acts than thoſe you gueſs, and it is a ſad thing to have to do with ſuch an Adverſary as you; it appears that you have a very good Opinion of your ſelf, and there is not a Quality more eſſential to a Presbyterian than Pride and Vanity, you have not read the Book you are concerned to read, if you ſet up for the publick Advocate of the *Kirk*; how came you to gueſs what Acts your Adverſary meant, unleſs he had cited thoſe Acts particularly: and therefore I adviſe you to read the Acts of the General Aſſembly more narrowly, and ſee if you can name any of the Papal Enchroachments upon the Civil Magiſtrate more daring and ambitious than that one Act which is cited in the Margine, and which is recorded to the Honour of Preſbytery. Mr. Ridpath, you ſee that I have a great deſire to court your Friendſhip, ſince I cite the Books exactly, that you look upon as Oracles. You tell us, after a long Declamation againſt King Charles II. his Government and the Doctrines of Paſſive Obedience, that Sir George Mackenzie's Arguments, in the defence of his Reign, are all of them built upon a falſe Narrative of Matter of Fact; as if the Rebellions againſt King Charles I. and II. were not notorious, and known all Europe over. The Scotch Rebels laid King Charles I. upon the Altar, and the Engliſh Rebels ſacrificed him; and this is no other Cenſure than what is obvious to every Man's Obſervation. Muſt we ſit down and tranſcribe all the Presbyterian Proteſtations, Remonſtrances, ſeaſonable Warnings, and Declarations, when every little Pamphlet is answered? Muſt we prove that Presbyterians are Rebels? that is as needleſs as to prove firſt Principles: for ſince the Covenant is the *Magna Charta* of your Religion, as you are diſtinguiſhed

July 28.
1648. ante
mer. Seſſ.
18. p. m. li
7. Act and
Declar. a-
gainſt the
Act of P.
pag. 17.

guished from other Christians, why should you think the Imputation of Rebellion to be any Reproach? Sir George Mackenzie gave the World a true Narrative of the first Rise and Occasion of those Laws that you complain of. And we are very glad how much you write against it, you but wound your own head, and ~~kick against the pricks~~: for his Narrative remains true, and founded upon the Records of Parliament, and Progress of your Rebellion, and still unanswered, as it is unanswerable. I know that one of your Club wrote a Pamphlet against his Defence of King Charles II's Government, entituled, a Vindication of the Presbyterians in Scotland, &c. It peeped out, as if it were afraid to see the light, but no body knows where to find it, and in a few days it vanished. 'Tis said to be printed for Edward Golding, 1692. I got one Copy accidentally, but all my Industry could not procure another. The Author is a very accomplish'd Gentleman, no doubt of it; he tells you, in the very first page of his Pamphlet, that he left the Law part unanswered. And this one Expression is enough to proclaim him a Fool, that he who had no knowledge in the Laws, should venture to answer Sir George Mackenzie's Book; just as if one should censure the Works of Tully and Quintilian, without any knowledge of the Rules of Oratory and Rhetorick; and, to let you see how grossly ignorant this poor Creature is, he tells us, that King Charles I. when the Earl of Traquair sat at the Helm of Affairs, imposed on the Subject an Oath, commonly called the Tender, with great Severity, and that it is not improbable but that the Covenant was a Counter Oath to that. Now Mr. Ridpath, I ask you how any Man can bear smiling to see how such a little Shuttlecock can assault the Memory and Writings of Sir George Mackenzie? Was the Covenant no older than the Tender? and was the Tender, (by which Men were made to part with all degrees of Loyalty, and to renounce the Family of the Stewarts) imposed with great Severity by King Charles I. and is this the Book that you think confutes Sir George Mackenzie's Vindication, better than the Doctor can defend it?

Pag. 4.

But your learned Author goes on, and tells us that the General Assembly (I suppose he means that in 1638.) did not throw out the Bishops without the Authority of Parliament, since they had their allowance for it; as if the General Assembly that threw out the Bishops had waited for the determination of a Parliament; and when Sir George pleads, that the Ecclesiastick State were always the first of the three Estates of Parliament, your little Man tells us, in opposition to this, some Stories of Monks and Culdees, by which the Church was governed from the beginning of Christianity in Scotland.

But

But is this any thing to our purpose, when we plead, that by so many Laws and Parliamentary Constitutions, our *Bishops* make up the first of the *Three Estates of Parliament*; and which is more, those very Laws are not yet repealed, by which the *Ecclesiastick State* is declared to be the first. And tho in the days of the *Covenant*, when the *Bishops* were expelled by Tumult and Violence, one of the *three Estates* was split into two, contrary to the fundamental Constitution of Parliaments, yet by unrepealed Laws and immemorial Possession, they remain the first of the *three Estates of Parliament*. He tells us next, that *there were no Bishops during King James's Residence, and consequently none sat in Parliament*; and must we be put to the drudgery of confuting such a sad Creature as this is, when the Records of Parliament give him the lie? And I speak it sincerely, I never saw any thing in Print more ignorantly written than that Pamphlet is; for he tells us again, that *he knew of no Persons of Quality put to death by Covenanters, save the Earl of Montrose*. And if you please to defend your learned Brother, you may; for my part, if I am not constrained to it, I am resolved never to look into his Pamphlet; nor do I know how to excuse my self at the Reader's hands, for inserting so many of his lamentable Impertinencies.

Ibid.

Pag. 5.

In another place of your Book, you accuse Sir *George Mackenzie* of having persecuted *Hallside*; but this Gentleman is here also, and no Man can speak more to the advantage of Sir *George Mackenzie*, in all Companies, and upon all occasions, than he does; and he flatly denies all the malicious Fictions that you have heaped together on that Subject.

If Laws have been made under the Reign of King *Charles II*, to restrain the Fury of Madmen and Incendiaries; neither the State, nor such as advised those Laws to be made are to be blamed; for there were no Laws made against the *Speculations* of Presbyterians, but against the Practices of such of them, whose *Principles* and *Ends* were equally destructive to humane Society, as they were pernicious to the particular Settlement of our Nation.

The Paragraph that follows is a true sample of your way of reasoning, when you say that *Nero* and *Julian* the *Apostate* had the Advantage of the *Primitive Christians*, in regard of Quality, Sense, and Interest. But I still think that the *Apostles* and *Primitive Christians* were Men of the best Sense, and far beyond all their Persecutors. Mr. *Ridpath*, to do you no piece of Injustice (for I disdain it, and one needs not take any Advantage of you) I let the Reader know, that in the Correction of your *Errata's*, you advise

Ibid.

to dash out the word *Sense* out of *lin. 32. of page 27.* but then when the word *Sense* is dashed out, you do not repeat faithfully the *Doctor's* Argument: for you know very well that he reckons the *Quality, Sense and Interest* of the Nobility that are for Episcopacy, as things that bear down the noise and clamour of all their Antagonists; you may raise *Monsters* as many as you please, and then fight with your own Dreams and Imaginations; but since you do not repeat an argument faithfully, you should let it alone. And what followed in the same Paragraph of the Postscript, *viz. That the Episcopal Nobility were men of parts, honour and integrity,* was to be considered in conjunction with the former; the Characters last named you do not deny to be true, and if so, how can *men of honour and integrity be perjured oppressors?* For my part, I never thought that Honour in its true notion could be separated from a good Conscience: and the Author of the Postscript intended to baffle the Calumnies of their opposers, by a compendious enumeration of the outward and inward advantages that the Patrons of Episcopacy possessed; so that if you was at the pains to answer this Argument, you ought not fraudulently to suppress such words, as contained its frame and energy: and I am content that you call me as well as the Author of the Postscript, a *Pedant, an Ass, a Blunderer, a Villain, a Liar, and a Papist*; if I tell you that you seem to have nothing in your view than to raise a little Dust, when you repeat an argument but not in the Authors words, it is no more his but yours; you may be taught your mistake by that of the Poet,

*Quem recitas meus est O! fidentine Libellus
Sed male dum recitas incipit esse tuus.*

Page 28.

You tell us next, that Sir George Mackenzie owns, that Presbyterian Ministers, and Presbyterian Jurors who were summoned to the trial of Malefactors of their own persuasion, seldom failed to condemn them; From this you conclude, that Sir George gives himself and the Dr. both the Lye, when they charge those Principles upon the Presbyterians in general: and this you say, discovers the falshood of that necessity, that the Episcopalians pretend the Government was under to make such Laws against the Presbyterians in its own defence. Your argument may be reduced into form thus: Some Presbyterian Ministers who lived peaceably at Edinburgh, blamed and condemned the practices and rebellions of the Cameronian Presbyterians: Ergo, the principles of Rebellion are not to be charged upon the Scotch Presbyterians in general. But Mr. Rid-

path,

part, here I deny your *Consequence*. For when we charge the *Presbyterians* in general with rebellious principles and practices, we do not intend to include every individual of that persuasion; for many of them do not see the just consequences of their own Principles, many of them have not courage enough to put them in execution: many of them may be naturally of so sweet a temper, that the felicity of their complexion resists the malignity of their *Temper*; yet notwithstanding of all this, the *Presbyterians* for the most part are guided by a Spirit of rebellion and ill nature. When one says such a thing is true of such a Sect or Fraternity; generally speaking, he does not intend that it should be understood in a strict universality, but with that latitude that the subject matter will allow; and if you say, that the severe Laws that you complain of were made against such *Malefactors*, as *Presbyterian Ministers* themselves condemned; then I infer, that the Laws were not made against *Presbyterians* as such, but against those *Rebels* who improved their *Covenants* and *Associations* into *Seditions*, *Tumults*, and *Insurrections*.

'Tis very true, that those *Presbyterian Ministers* who were of a calmer temper, were sometimes employed to reclaim the *Malefactors* to their Duty, yet they could not prevail with them, because the *Western Enthusiasts* had a higher opinion of their own Preachers, who were *Remonstrators* and through-paced *Evangelists*, than they had of the more peaceable and sober *Presbyterians*; why then are our Laws and Governours blamed for restraining the madness of such who were thought intolerable by *Presbyterians* as well as by the King and Parliament, and your reasonings in this Paragraph plainly infer, that the King had nothing in his view but to preserve his hereditary Right, and the peace of his Subjects, when such and such Laws were made against illegal and tumultuous meetings, as men of all persuasions were necessitated to condemn.

But you add further, that this confession of Sir George Mackenzie's, discovers the Falshood of that necessity which the *Episcopalists* pretend the Government was under, to make such Laws against *Presbyterians* in their own defence. Mr. Ridpath, if the Government was assaulted, and the peace openly disturbed, there was a plain necessity to make such Laws as were thought proper to restrain the fury of such Zealors, whether they were *Presbyterians* or *Anabaptists*; all is one to me; and if you say that *Presbyterians* were not guilty of such practices, then I say there were no Laws made against the *Presbyterians*: for the King and Parliament did not consider them as *Presbyterians* but as heady, incorrigible, and stubborn Rebels,

Ibid.

Ibid.

Rebels, who were restless in their nature, and gave them perpetual disturbance.

Ibid.

What follows is of the same nature with the former; You tell us that Sir George says, that *the hereditary Sheriffs refused to put the Laws in execution against Conventicles, by which they became formidable.* This you pretend destroys two other Assertions propagated by our Party, *viz.* That *Presbyterianism is not popular, and that none but the Rabble are their friends.* But Mr. Ridpath, all this proceeds from your incurable precipitancy and ignorance. For some *hereditary Sheriffs* might be inclined to favour Presbytery, and yet 'tis very true, that the most of their friends are among the Rabble; and when we say so, we do not intend to say, but that here and there an *hereditary Sheriff*, or a Gentleman, may be a stiff Covenanter, and may differ very little in his Education and principles, from the inferiour sort of people, and if at any time we say that the Rabble only favours the Presbyterians, we understand that *Proposition* in a limited sense, as all such *Propositions* must be understood, for generally speaking (except it be in the West of Scotland) the *Presbyterians* have very few Friends among the *Nobility or Gentry*; and though they had not the majority of the Nation, yet they might prove formidable, and when Sir George says that they were formidable, can you infer from it that they were more numerous than their opposites. At this rate you may prove, that *Highwaymen*, and *Robbers* are more numerous than honest *Citizens and Subjects*, because a very few of them are able to frighten a whole County.

We are ever and anon told by you and the rest of your Party, that *the Majority of Scotland is for Presbytery*; but the wiser men of your Faction think otherwise, and therefore they took care to secure their *inclosure* (into which they stumbled by a fortuitous concurrence of many accidents) by several Laws and barricadoes not to be named in this place.

Ibid.

When you recollect your self a little, perhaps you may acknowledge that it is not wisely done of you to abuse so many of the *Nobility of Scotland*, by such infamous Lyes and Forgeries as you are pleased to print, particularly when you tell us, That *the Court employed bloody, cut-throat Papists to ruine the Country.* You name the *Earl of Airlie*, and the *Laird of Meldrum*; 'tis true, this may pass in a Coffee-house at London where the *Earl of Airgile* is not known; but there is not a Scots-man alive that ever heard that either of these Gentlemen were Papists. Now this is very sad stuff Mr. Ridpath, and any man that undergoes the toil of

of considering your Books, if he knew not whence they came, must be guarded by extraordinary patience, when truth and innocence are almost in every line so boldly invaded.

What you mean when you tell the Dr. that he has wounded Pag. 29. his pretences to *Loyalty* by defending *Sir George Mackenzie's Book*, is to me a Mystery; for I am confident that you are but very little acquainted with him or his pretences either. But you complain that he did not answer your argument taken from the consequences of *Passive Obedience*, and that he turns his back and takes no notice of you. Well, Mr. *Ridpath*, it is but just that a person of your valour should be met in open Fields; but you must not conclude that a man is pusillanimous when he retires, unless you have him so much under your authority that he dare not move a step without your order, nor answer any thing unless in the method that you appoint him.

Ibid.

You impute all the direful effects of Arbitrary Power, to the Episcopal Party and the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*; yet I am apt to believe, that there is no people in the World loves Arbitrary Power so much as the *Presbyterians* do; and that they hate it only when it is not in their own keeping. If by *Arbitrary Power* the *Presbyterians* mean some such power as is unaccountable to any earthly Tribunal, such a power there must be in every Government, and if it be not managed by a true Christian publick Spirit, it may be as grievous and intolerable in the hands of a Parliament, as in the hands of a King. To declaim against arbitrary power, is to declaim against all Government; for there is no Government upon Earth but exercises in its Supreme Judicatories arbitrary power and jurisdiction, for which it is not accountable to any but to God alone, where this finally decisive and Supreme power ought to be lodged, is a Question that I leave to *Lawyers* and *Statesmen*; they know our municipal Laws and Constitutions. When the sins of a Nation provoke God, then he punishes them by foolish, extravagant, and cruel *Magistrates*; when it is otherwise, and that God is pleased with them, they enjoy good Laws, peace and protection under wise *Governours*; and this is all the remedy that is left in humane affairs, against publick calamities and disasters. There was no Meeting since the World began that declaimed against arbitrary power so much as the long Parliament did, nor was ever England so miserable as under their Tyranny and Oppressions; as long as the administration of publick affairs is left to the disposal of men, so long we may be

be exposed to *arbitrary power*; and the former must be as long as the World continues: a *Parliament* may be as tyrannical as any *King*; and when *they* are thus pack'd together to serve a particular design, we must truckle under them until those *Laws* are repealed by another; so that *Passive Obedience* thus stated, is necessary under all Forms and Models of Government; it is all one thing to me whether I am oppress'd by the *King*, or by *King* and *Parliament*; there is no Judicatory allows the remedy of a *Rebellion*, and what all Judges determine in *all Nations*, and at *all times*, must be the *Voice of God*.

They who plead for the *Supreme and decisive Authority* of the *General Assembly* in *Ecclesiastical* affairs, ought to be more friendly to *Arbitrary power*; for though their sentence against any particular Clergyman were never so unjust and oppressive, yet he must strike Sail and hold his peace, and practice *Non Resistance* to a greater height, than ever the *Episcopal Clergy* preached it, if he would not incur the highest Censures of the *Kirk*. And this *Spiritual Tyranny* is more insupportable, than that which reaches only our temporal concerns; and I am content without any blustering or foaming to reason this modestly with your self, or any other that you can name, but still with this proviso, that there be many more present than you and I, for I am afraid that we do not well understand one another, and therefore, if ever we meet we must have a *Moderator* to keep the peace.

pag. 30.

You say that the Dr. contradicts himself, because he thought that there was no injury done to the *Presbyterians*, in publishing a Book that exposed their Fooleries; and yet he grants, that the Author of that Book was perhaps unwary as to some instances. Good Mr. Ridpath, I see no contradiction here at all, for a Book may serve the end for which it was published, though perhaps the Author mistakes himself in some single instances. There is no Author now adays sets up for an infallible Dictator; and you tell us in another place of your last Pamphlet, that it is not possible to publish so many particular stories without committing some faults; there is no doubt but you have a very good opinion of your own Book that you last printed, yet I hope you are convinced before now, that the *Covenant* was imposed upon Children when they entered the *Church*. Whether the Author of that Book mistook himself or not, is not positively affirmed by the Dr. so your contradiction vanishes into air and noise. You raise more dust than a Coach and six Horses, when you are about to kill a Fly.

It

It is probable that the Author of the Postscript may be justified for having said that Mr. Rutherford's Writings, in some places, would pass all human understanding. I have no commission from him or any of his Friends to return your Language in Species. You tell us, that if Mr. Rutherford were alive, he would have scorned to have fouled his Fingers with such an *Enscapit Hawker*; but indeed, Mr. Ridpath, I do not think that Mr. Rutherford was so proud, but that some time or other, he fouled his Fingers with *worse* Creatures than the Doctor. But what was it that he said of Mr. Rutherford's Writings? that, in some places they were very dark and obscure; and was this any such extraordinary Crime? Mr. Ridpath, I love to say very little of Men that are dead, if you think that his Writings are so clear, pray give us your Commentaries upon his second Chapter of his second Exercitation *Pro divina Gratia. 2. Resp. Distinguo Vocem* (*verum*) *quod unusquisque tenetur credere, id est, verum, metaphysice & fundamentaliter, in se & quoad eventum, concedo majorem & tum minorem pernego.* But still he left us to guess what the other Member of the Distinction may be. Therefore take it thus, *Quod unusquisque tenetur credere, id est, verum, logicè, formaliter, extra se, & quoad non eventum; nego Majorem.* And then both the one and the other are good strong Nonlense, in all its formalities. But he goes on, *Christum enim pro unoquoque mortuum esse in se fundamentaliter & metaphysice, non est verum sed falsum. Christum pro unoquoque Mortuum esse metaphysice falsum,* is a Phrase I am not acquainted with; and if one durst speak it, the Author seems not, (notwithstanding of all the Flights of his Metaphysics) to advert to the *vera* distinction between the *Veritas Metaphysica* and the *Veritas Logica*. For *Veritas Metaphysica numeratur inter proprietates Entis, & consequenter non objectum fidei sed simplicis apprehensionis; at propositionibus logicè veris assentimur vel propter testantem auctoritatem, vel propter rei evidentiam:* And the Question is not *de Metaphysica veritate hujus propositionis, sed de veritate Logica.* This is not the only Instance that may be pick'd out of this Paragraph to prove it *obscure* and *unintelligible*; that other Phrase *in se & quoad eventum concedo Majorem,* is as dark as any thing can be; nor do I remark here the Solecism of his *Latin, quoad Eventum*; but I name this Exercitation as *unintelligible* from the beginning to the end. And because you are a Man of honour, and cannot endure Contradiction with any Patience, it were a more gallant Exercise for you to prove that this *Exercitation* of his, is plain and solid Theology, than to blot so much Paper with your imaginary Libels against the Clergy. You fight much at the rate that the *Tartars* do, when they are driven before their

Enemies; or rather like the *Dutch*, who are mounted on Horseback that they may flee with greater Convenience: but if you have as much Courage and Honour, as you have Bawling and Impudence, come to a close Engagement, and prove that Mr. *Rutherford's* Answers to the forementioned Argument are solid, plain and intelligible. What miraculous Feats other *Presbyterians* can do, is nothing to your purpose. Add to the former Instance Mr. *Rutherford's* Argument in his 22. Chapter of his *Disputatio Scholastica de divina Providentia*, to prove that there is no opposition between Sin and the Divine Nature, which I cannot now transcribe, and yet still I have the Confidence to say that it is foolish, childish and frivolous, and of the most pernicious consequence upon the Morals of Mankind. For if there is no opposition between the Divine Nature and Sin, *antecedenter ad liberum D E I decretum*, Men may be brought to think that Sin is not so odious in it self, nor at so great a distance from true Perfection, as the Scriptures represent it. But if you would see many more passages that are unintelligible, read his *Disquisitiones de Ente possibili*, and the former *Exercitation*, and if any thing can convince you, you may be then forced to acknowledge that his Writings are obscure, and consequently the Doctor's saying so did not furnish you with the least umbrage of charging Sir *George Mackenzie* with the grossest Immoralities of Life, for such I think the subornation of Witnesses is.

Pag. 32.

The next Blow is for his Incivility to Mr. *Rule*, that he does not allow him the Title of Doctor. Truly, Mr. *Ridpath*, if he wilfully made use of any other Complement towards him, than what is just, there is no Man alive more ready to retract his Error than he; he thought there was no rudeness in bestowing upon him the Title by which he was ordinarily known; and if the Doctor knew not the several steps of his Promotion, I see no reason why you can accuse him of Incivility, and the thing being purely indifferent; if he had been better informed, he would not deny any thing that he knew to be so easie and innocent.

Next you tell us that you do not believe the two instances that are cited in that Postscript against Mr. *Rule* upon the Doctor's Authority. But why, Mr. *Ridpath*, did the Author say so of him barely upon his own Authority, or are they not to be seen both of them in his Printed Books; and are not you much more uncivil to him, who revive Stories when perhaps they are entirely forgotten by others? The *decretum prae damnatum* was not the Fiction of my Friend, nor yet his new and unaccountable Criticism of the word *Ordinatio*; and now you may add another, which is *decretum pra-*
teritum,

terium. And you may see these new *Decrees* (never mentioned before by any Clafs of *Droines*) in page 66 of his *Vindication of the Church of Scotland*. And now I think one is fufficiently provoked to call you impudent, that you bring above-board things that you neither understand nor defend.

You complained, in your former Pamphlet of the Injuries done to Mr. *Urquhart* and Mr. *Kirkton*; because the first was said to have spoken contemptuously of our *Blessed Saviour* and the *Lord's Prayer*, and the other alledged, that *Abraham run out of the Land of Chaldaea for debt*. The Author of the Postscript told you that both these Stories (which you your self thought unpardonable) could be proved; and I am confident many more of that nature. But you tell us that you are *sufficiently satisfied*, by those who have lately made enquiry into the Affair, that the whole is a malicious Calumny. So we must take it upon your Word and theirs, it might be reasonably expected from you, that, at least, you would have procured under their own hands solemn Attestations that they never said any such thing; and that was all that you could do to prove your *Negative*: and this might have been easily had, especially from Mr. *J. K.* who lives at *Edinburgh*; nor is there any of us so far exasperated against him as not to believe his own Testimony solemnly and seriously delivered. And this is more Civility on our part, than any of them will allow us at any time, or upon any occasion. If I were at *Edinburgh* I could prove the *Affirmative*; and you must excuse me to continue just where I was, notwithstanding of all the Informations you have received.

The following *Peragraph* hath in it more Impertinencies than there are Lines, and yet it is probable that many of your Sect may think it *seraphically witty*. The Author of the Postscript said, that *the absurd and ludicrous Sect metamorphos'd Religion and its solemn Exercises into Theatrical Scenes*. Another of the same Fraternity says, that your Preachers were *whining Fellows that drivelled at Mouth and Eyes*. And thus you make them contradict one another, and then you run away with a loud *holla*, as if you were at the Head of the Rabble pulling down a Cathedral, to see so many *Curates* slain with the *Jaw bone of an Ass*. The word *Theatrical Scenes* does not determine whether your Preachers acted *Comedies* or *Tragedies*, and a whining *Scaramouchi* may act his part in either; and if so, the many Words, which you have gathered to no purpose, discover your Ignorance, and not any Contradiction amongst them whom you hate. But, Mr. *Ridpath*, are you not in a strange Career when you can never hit upon the true nature of a Contradiction;

I am not surpriz'd that you do not know the Nature of a *Comedy*, and *Tragedy*, for you never read *Aristotle* ~~or his works~~, nor note of the Commentators upon him, either ancient or modern; yet you might, in two months time (for so long I am told you was at the Univerſity) have learned what a ſtrict and formal Contradiſtion is.

That the Presbyterians were better at Libelling than their Neighbours, is evident from all Records; and therefore the Author of the Poſtſcript had good Reason to ſay, that *Libelling* was their *Characteriſtick*, as that which they moſt practiſed, and excelled all others in; that, in which they placed moſt of their Strength and Confidence, and which they will never forbear, if they happen to live where there is any to be accuſed. But you ſay that *your Enemies were the firſt Aggreſſors*, and their bold Attempts againſt the Godly, juſtifies all the rough Treatment that they have met with. Mr. *Riſpaith*, there is one thing that I would entreat you to condeſcend to, and it is, in itſelf, very juſt and reaſonable, and unleſs you yield to it, we may fight to our laſt breath without ſatisfying one another or ſerving any good Deſign, the thing is this, when you accuſe Perſons and Parties, you muſt be more expreſs, definite and particular in your Libels. I am of the Opinion that it is not poſſible for Presbyterians to forbear Libelling, eſpecially upon all public Turns and Revolutions; their Libels againſt the Clergy both in *England* and in *Scotland*, are ſtill upon Record. Did you never ſee the Centuries of ſcandalous Miniſters accuſed before the Long-Parliament. The General Libel againſt the Biſhops of *Scotland* may be ſeen, when you pleaſe, in the *King's Large Manifeſto*, and in the firſt Volume of *Niſſon's Collections*, and if you believe neither of theſe Books, ſince they were both written by *Malignants*, read the *Acts of the General Aſſembly*, 1638, and there you have the very ſame Libels mentioned; and there is no Presbyterian but knows, that the Libels againſt the Biſhops, in the Year 1638, were read from all the Pulpits of the Nation where the *Aſſembly's* Authority was obeyed; and what is ſaid, by the Author of the Poſtſcript, of their Behaviour towards Archbiſhop *Spotswood*, is commonly attested by the oldeſt Men in that corner of the Country, near *St. Andrews*. Particularly this is more carefully preſerved in the Family of *Balfour*. And the Biſhop of O. and Mr. *Sage of Glasgow*, had this very Story from the Laird of *Balfour's* own mouth. 'Tis true that there is an Act of the General Aſſembly, mentioning the Libels againſt the Biſhops, but there are alſo among the unprinted Acts, Acts of Excommunication and Depoſition againſt ſome Prelates; and when

when those Acts are produced, I offer to prove, from their own Authentick Records, many more steps of their Fraud and Artifice. That there are such Acts as I last named unprinted, *vid. Index of the principal unprinted Acts of the Assembly at Glasgow, 1638.* And if they were not afraid of being discovered and exposed, upon this very Head, those Acts had been printed as well as the other Principal Acts; nay, the Act against *Episcopacy* it self was not printed, because it could not but alarm all the Protestant Churches abroad against them, when the Order of *Episcopacy* was condemned as *simpliciter* unlawful; a thing unheard in the Christian Church, until the mungrel Conventicle at *Glasgow* sat: therefore the Act against *Episcopacy* was left unprinted as well as the Acts of *Excommunication* and *Deposition* against some Prelates. And this is either altogether unknown to, or dissembled by Mr. *Gillie*, when he denies the Truth of that Story, as related by the Author of the *Five Letters*. And you are a Fool to think, that, in those days, when Rebellion and Hypocrisy were triumphant, they would have stuck at such little Punctilio's, and not practise all Arts to delude the Populace. I hope you do not deny what use they made of *Margaret Mitchelson's* Visions, Raptures and Revelations, by which they persuaded the People that the Covenant was authorised by immediate Revelations from Heaven, as well as by the Popular Tumults at *Edinburgh*. The Knavery against Archbishop *Spotswood* was an Injury done to him and the Church; but the counterfeit Raptures of *Margaret Mitchelson* (countenanced by your Party) mocked and defied God's Justice and Providence, no less than it ridicul'd and prophan'd all Religion. [*Vid. King's Large Declaration.*] Nay, they procured Libels against the Clergy from most Counties in England; and in those Counties where they had none to work upon of their own Gang, they forged Libels, and presented such counterfeit Petitions in the name of such Counties, and dispersed their Forgeries for real Truths, to make their Party appear numerous, and the Clergy odious. And Sir *Thomas Aston* petitioned the *House of Lords* against this villanous Practice; but this was not welcome to those Lords who favoured the Faction, and therefore Sir *Thomas Aston* was reprehended, and the Forgers gently rebuked. And my Author truly observes, that this was like *approve aglorious Reformation, which was built upon such Foundations, and advanced by such Arts and Methods.* So that if you mean the former Presbyterians, they were the first Aggressors; and if you mean the modern, they practised this Trade of Libelling ever since the beginning

* Nals.
Coll. I.
Vol. pag.

of

of the *Revolution*, and long before the Book appeared that provoked your displeasure, and they are much better at it than their opposites; their curiosity reaches to the meanest concerns. There are no people in the World can give such exact account of their Neighbours, *when they rise*, and *when they go to bed*, what they eat, and what they drink, what they say, and with whom they converse; and this is the reason why they so often blow up the neighbourhood into flames of Contention and Calumny. Name me but one Man since the name of *Presbyterians* was known to the World, that ever gave them any sensible provocation, whom they have not persecuted with their Tongues and Libels to the utmost of their power.

They were not only the first Aggressors, but they continued their practices under the Reign of *Charles II.* and since the Revolution, the Libels against the Clergy have employed their Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, not to mention the Libels against *Masters of Universities*, where there was no Accuser. I have insisted the longer upon this, to let you see the vanity of a common topick that runs through both your Pamphlets; Libelling is so peculiar to the *Presbyterians*, that they cannot think of reforming it; in all their conversations their discourse runs most upon them that are absent. It is an idle thing to deny plain matter of Fact, especially when it is supported by publick Records, Practices, and the unanimous Suffrages of a whole Nation. I think it enough to prove by the most undeniable evidence, that in this art of Libelling, you are the first aggressors, and the only experienced practitioners, without putting my self to the pains of calling you *Rogue, Villain, Rascal, impudent Liar*, and such like gentle names as you bestow upon your Adversaries.

Page 33. You add, *That it is natural for a Cadet of Dumbarton's Regiment, which used to plunder people of their goods, to rob Men of their good Names*, and therefore ought not to be believed. This is a new Article which we have not heard of before, that he plundered people of their goods, and it supplies the defects of the Original Libel in the *Inquisition*; and it is very ordinary for the *Presbyterians* to represent such as they Libel, actually guilty of the breach of the *Ten Commandments*: Now Your Woman amongst the Corn, and the plundering people of their goods, added to the former Libel makes him actually guilty of the breach of all. For in the first Libel, He is accused of having *no Religion*, and of *Swearing*, so at one Stroke he transgresses the first four; and the two Articles added in your

your *Continuation*, together with his Reflections against the *Presbyterians* make him guilty of the rest, either expressly or by necessary consequence. But Mr. *Ridpath*, you do not know the discipline of the *French Army*, and if he had Inclinations to rob and plunder, this is a more proper time to practise it; when He is turned out of all his Possessions, and allowed no other employment under this Reformation than to answer Libels. And indeed I think if you were a Soldier, you have no principle to restrain you from plundering, when you might venture with safety, especially in a *Papish Country*, the true *Israelites*, and *Covenanters* might take the *Egyptian* goods without scruple or remorse; as they formerly did at *New-Castle*, contrary to Articles and Capitulations.

Your Grammatical Lecture of the *Litæ: Mutabiles*; you may recommend to your Scholars, and whatever proficiency you have made in Grammar, you seem to me to reason much like the Gentleman that I formerly named, who thought himself of *Ovid's* Family.

You had better detest the mention of *Archbishop Sharp*, than bring him so often upon the Stage to the disgrace of your Party. He was certainly murdered; not by an accidental effort of fury and passion as you alludge; but in a most deliberate manner, after many Cabals and consultations kept for that very end; and the Author of the *Postscript* did not reason from *Shields* his authority so much as from the Principles he went upon; his Book being an accurate Collection of several authentick Papers; and avowed practices of his Party since the *Reformation*; nor was it ever said, that sober *Presbyterians* did allow of his Murder; but how few of them are sober? and I can tell you more, that the *Presbyterian Ladies* in *Fife* at that very time, did industriously shun in all conversation to call this bloody *Act*, a Murder; but gravely said, that indeed the *Man was slain*, but they could not think that any thing that was performed by so great a *Saint* as *Rashburn* and his religious Cut-throats, could be called a Murder. And when such practices are charged upon the *Presbyterians* in general, it is not intended (as I told you once already) to involve every individual; it is not possible to deprave the nature of some particular men to that degree, though they seem to maintain principles that yield pernicious Consequences.

But

But, Mr. Ridpath, by conversing with your self I am become a little more bold, and I offer to prove from Presbyterian principles, that Archbishop Sharp ought to have been murdered; are not all the Covenanters obliged to bring their Enemies to condign punishment? and when the Magistrates are open and avowed Enemies to the cause of God, is it not lawful for some to interpose? especially when acted by Heroical impulse to stop the universal deluge of Impiety, that was likely to drown the whole Nation, to recover the freedom of the Church that was run down by Tyranny and Perjury, contrary to all National Obligations, former Laws and Liberties. Did not King Charles II. himself know that he had forfeited his Title to the Crown? and was it necessary according to you to delay the execution of Justice in this calamitous posture of publick affairs, unless it could be procured in due form? when it was not possible for honest men to be heard; especially since the Covenanters struck off the heads of Montrose, Huntley, Haddo, Spenswood, for acting by a Commission from the very King, by whose Commission they themselves pretended to hold their places. What is there in the Murder of Archbishop Sharp that may not be justified by your Principles? Did not He deserve death? No doubt you think he did; and if it be only the Forms that you stand upon, must the seasonable execution of Justice be delayed, because it cannot be had in all its regular steps and formalities, when the Magistrates openly tyrannize and oppress our Liberties Civil and Religious? At this rate you disown the most publick acts of the Covenanters. By what form of Law then in being, did the Tables of your Covenanters sit at Edinburgh, when they were forbidden by open Proclamation to continue any longer their Consultations and Cabals. If you pretend the necessity of their affairs, was there ever any state of things more lamentable in it self, than you represent the Reign of King Charles II. to be? and if so, why might not some resolute and gallant Heroes, some true Sons of the Covenant, venture, without the ordinary forms, to do justice speedily upon such an eminent opposer of Religion as Archbishop Sharp was? The Laws of self defence and preservation, as you explain them, dispence with Forms, when the thing is for the matter right in it self, and the Magistrate not only neglects, but avowedly opposes Truth, Justice, and Innocence; then is time for men of Courage and Resolution to step forth and assert their Religion and Liberties,

* Contimiat.

not by the tedious method of Law, Order and Process, when *Governments* and *Original Contracts* are turned topsy-turvy, but speedily and by open Force pull *Antichrist* from the Throne. Mr. *Ridpath*, be advised by me, do not stand so much upon Forms; else you must part with your best beloved Principle and Covenanted Reformation.

And if the Murder of Archbishop *Sharp* be sincerely disowned by the *Presbyterians*, since they are so often upbraided and reproached with it; why do not they by some solemn Act of their Assembly declare, that the killing of Cardinal *Beaton* and Archbishop *Sharp* were villainous Murders? tho the first was adhered in by *Popers*, and the latter by singing of Psalms.

You oppose your own Authority to Mr. *Shield*, and this I am sure many of your own party will laugh at; whether you have the Ascendant of the Doctor in the point of *Philosophy*, I will give you my Thoughts of that before I end this Letter.

The Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* comes again in your way, and nothing is more odious to so brisk and daring a Spirit as the very thought of it came and fills a Discipline; and you refer us to the incomparable Argument lately published by Mr. *Johnson*. Mr. *Ridpath*, I agree with you, that the Preface of Mr. *Johnson*'s Book hath in it very pleasant Stroaks of Wit and Fancy; but as to the argumentative part of his Book, it proves the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* to be *Heterodox*, by an Argument of equal Strength with that of your own, by which you prove the *Episcopal Clergy* to be *Embustlers*. Page 34.

You tell us next, that his Defences of Mr. *Brown* and Mr. *Cant*, are so like a *Pedantick Doctor*, that they deserve no regard, and what you said of them you can best see the Authors to answer it to their Faces. Now we fall upon the Common place of *Pedantry*; and Mr. *Ridpath*, you must understand that there are *Pedants* in all Employments. If the vanity of appearing learned and knowing where there is no solid Foundation to support the Character, do form that Name, perhaps the crying for many *Legions down* in your Pamphlet, which you do not at all understand, may, in the Opinion of some, make you pass for a *Pedant*. But, to let this go, tho the Doctor's being a *Cadet* in *Dunkerton's* Regiment, was not, in your Opinion, an infectious Omen of Piety and Humanity; yet one might think it a good Passage of his Freedom from *Pedantry*, at least as good as any of your most remarkable Advantages in my Lord *Wb—son's* Kitchen. F The

no The Doctor laid, that *Mr. George Brown, Minister of Drysdale*, proessed *Andrew Johnston of Lockerby*, vigorously before the Ecclesiastical Court for his Crime of Adultery, and therefore his alledged contivance was a *Prohibition*. *Fogers*, in Answer, the Affirmative was his, which I prove by the following Certificate, under the hands of four Witnesses; two in the Parish of *St. Margaret's Westminster*, and other in *Canhill* near the *Exchange*, and the fourth without *Aldersgate*.

WE whose Names are underwritten, hereby testify and declare, upon Honour and Conscience, that, to our certain knowledge, *Mr. George Brown, Minister of Drysdale* in the Diocese of *Glasgow*, proessed *Andrew Johnston of Lockerby* for his Crime of Adultery with *Sarah Brown*, that he got him formally excommunicated. Given under our Hands, in London the Fourth of July, 1699.

Alex. Guthrie
Andr. Johnston
Thos. Mitchell
Alex. Johnston

You tell us next, that his Defence of *Mr. Brown* and *Mr. Cant* are so like a *Persecuted Doctor*, that they deserve no regard, and ought

Now, *Mr. Ridpath*, where lies the *Palamry* in saying so, and so of *Mr. Brown*; is not your Accusation against him proved to be

lie. And as for your Charge against *Mr. Andrew Cant*, that *Mr. Cant* is a *Prophet*, and is purely a Fiction from top to bottom; we

cannot prove a Negative; but we shall show by transcribing the Words that we who are his most intimate Acquaintances never heard of

any such thing; he was never suspended; and consequently never used any mean Arts to ingratiate himself with his Superiors;

the first is a Romance, and therefore the *Superstition* must be a Forgery. And when you charge the *Doctor* with *Palamry*, read

over your own learned Book of the *Sufferings* of *Protestantism* from the *Episcopalian* to the *Presbyterian* and *Methodist* Bishops

The Lord W^m—ton's *Richm*

that you bestow upon such as you bark at, viz. that they are *Tyranno-Papa-Prelatical*; and then let any impartial Reader judge whether you do not deserve a place *ante omnem circulum* amongst the *Patrons*. There is nothing in all the *Stobæian* Flexions and Compositions, like that High and Majestick Word, *Tyranno-Papa-Prelatical*. 'Tis worthy of the noble Mr. *Ridpath's* high flown *Genius*; and if you were on the top of a *Hilkin Gallows*, preaching to a *Field-Mustering*, this one single Word would confound your Auditors into a belief that you were a *precious, gracious, convincing Man*.

Who could stand before so much Eloquence and Acuteness, *Bombabamabides*, *Clamant ad id forebides in Campir Gargusidoni*.

The Author of the Postscript saith, that you *charged our Superiours* with such as were *deposed for their Immoralities*, as *Dean Hamilton*, and *Cockburn* of *St. Babbens*. To this you say, that you *charged them only with having protected those Men from the Punishment due to their Impiety*. But did they protect them when they were deposed? And how can you say that ever they were protected? If their Superiors waited for full and clear Evidences against them before they pronounced Sentence, here was no protection of Criminals, but Obedience to the Laws; and tho your Party be not tied to Forms, yet we think ourselves obliged to act as we are directed by the Laws.

You fall next upon *Archbishop Paterfon*, and the Lies that you have published formerly of *Archbishop Cairncross*, which are plainly refuted in his own printed Letter, to the Conviction of all men; shews what credit you deserve when you accuse either of them.

Mr. *Ridpath*, you think it a palpable Blunder to say, that *some who complied with Episcopacy after the Restoration of King Charles II. were Presbyterians*; and this is another sad Instance of your Ignorance; for they were required to do nothing inconsistent with the Principles of moderate Presbyterians; and all the Ring-leaders of the *Covenanters* had their Mission from the Bishops of the Church of *Scotland*; and do you think that they did not then conform to *Episcopacy*, or that they were not Presbyterians? I am afraid that the little *Club*, whereof you are Moderator, does not thoroughly understand the Principles of *Presbytery*. Had we no Presbyterians Ministers in *Scotland*, by such as deserted their Churches in the West after the Restoration? was it ever required of

Ibid.

any of the other conforming to Episcopacy, to give up a Liberty
was preferable to a Party of *Presbyterians*; that they still enjoyed
their own Liberty of thinking & acting as they pleased, if they were
their Superiours in *Religion*, *Wit*, *Fortitude*, *Modesty*, *Industry*, *Mr. Wallis*,
And might think that *Liquid* match, *Prophets*
the they conformed to Episcopacy. They themselves think
they were so still; nor by certain knowledge the last was, and I
know him to be a honest Man, that he never endeavour'd to
hide his Principles; and he thought that he did nothing in
conforming to Episcopacy, inconsistent with his own Opinions, and
he would have contemn'd still in the Communion of the Episcopalian
Church if a later Test had not removed him. You must not
think that all the Presbyterians are confined to an equal degree of
Heat: there are some, tho' very few, more calm and solid than
their younger Brethren. I Read *Mr. Rutherford's* *the Right of Presbytery*,
(and I cannot name a Book more acceptable, perhaps you
may meet with some Notions there that are not so agreeable to the
late Model of Presbytery; the last Edition of a Book is still in
favour & commendation. And if it was a Blunder to say, that some
who continued Presbyterian in their Principles, conformed to the
external Order of the Church under Episcopacy, they who did so
conform are obliged to defend him.

Ibid.

You still oblige your Adversaries to prove *Negatives*; when you libel Dr. Canaries, you tell us, that *the the Administrators and Judges* declared, that *they could make nothing of the Accusation brought against him, yet that will not amount to prove it false*; and because a *Negative* in matter of Fact is not demonstrated (a thing in itself absolutely impossible) you therefore conclude, that still you may accuse him as guilty; but if nothing could be made of it, why should you propagate or continue the Slander? For not only are you destitute of true and solid Proof; but all your Evidence when they are aggravated by Presbyterian Malice, could never be heightened into a plausible Presumption of his Fault. If I should accuse you of having committed *Adultery* with your *Minister*, you could not prove it to be false otherwise than by letting the World know, that *nothing could be made of it*; and if so, one honest Man will defame you upon that head.

Ibid.

But you tell us, that *there is unexceptionable Evidence of the Woman's having declared the thing her self.* What think *you* her self declared I know not; but for the unexceptionable Evidence, tis only upon

upon Record in the World of the *Adon*, else we had seen it in legible Characters long e'er now. But you tell us, that the reputation of your Informer is fairer than that of either of the two Dr's. Mr. Ridpath, I do not know who this Gentleman is, and therefore in modesty I must forbear to make comparisons; but if he will preferre his Reputation, he must smother his Evidence.

What you desire as towards the close of this Session, is past my skill to find out; when you say, That we have a very pregnant instance of a Person of no mean Note, whose accusation most in England are satisfied in truth, and yet we see nothing can be made out, neither before the Judges nor the Lords. Mr. Ridpath, You leave it uncertain whether the Person of no mean Note be the Accuser, or the Accused. But to demonstrate the impertinence of this Instance, and that you understand Law as little as you do the Rules of Logick. I put the case, that *Titus* accuses his wife *Maria* of Adultery; the Judges may be persuaded that the accusation of *Titus* is true, though the evidences be not so full as the Law requires; yet being plain and positive in their nature, and but a degree removed from full proof; such presumptions of guilt which the *Civilians* call *presumptiones juris & desure*, leave deep impressions upon all, when duly conveyed to our knowledge; because they are as near as can be to that which is *probaatio in foro*. But pray, have you any such presumptions against the Dr? Is there any plain evidence against him? and if nothing can be made of it as the Judicatories declare, then 'tis many degrees below a Presumption; much less that higher presumption which is the ground of a reasonable Suspicion.

But you add, that Suppose the accusation against the Dr. to be false, yet it argues a great want of cleanly Adm amongst the Episcopallians, that they should choose so Adm for Agent who lay under a flagrant Scandal. The Apostle's Rule is clear, that a Bishop ought to be blameless. A surmise magnified by Presbyterian malice illustrates rather than darkens a man's Reputation; and clears his innocence; not so he evil spoken of by such whole Element is Calumny; it is an argument of no great Spirit, and far less activity. But you say, that the Apostle's Rule is clear; I lay to you, but your Head is not clear, because the Apostle lays, that a Bishop ought to be blameless; therefore you conclude, that if Bishops at any time are evil spoken of and traduced, they must be no longer Bishops. At this rate the most innocent and deserving

Ibid.

serving men must be disowned, and the greatest Luminaries of the Church must expect to be cashier'd. *Abanastius* was accused of abominable immoralities; and *St. John the Baptist* was said to have a Devil; and the Great Bishop of our Souls was accused of being a friend to Publicans and Sinners; he went to Feasts and entertainments which the Puritanical Pharisee could not behold without grumbling and censuring; they would quietly whisper in their Neighbours Ears, that though he said many good things, and wrought many Miracles, yet he was still a stranger to the power of Godliness; he kept ill Company, and the Modern Pharisees would add, that he was for forms of Prayer; and a great many other things he did, that the Spirit of detraction took by the wrong handle. If your Commentary upon these words, *A Bishop ought to be blameless*, had appear'd before the Scotch Eloquence came abroad, it ought to have had its own room in that Book, *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram*, raised many Scandals, and they were Scandals of Prelacy and Priest-craft too, against *Moses and Aaron*; and by your argument they ought both of them to have been deprived of their Honour and Government.

Pag. 37.

The next mistake is as foolish and impertinent, though not so dangerous as your wresting the Holy Scriptures to serve the heats of your deluded Fancy. You tell us, that Dr. M—— was very angry that you said of him, [*commonly called Dr.*] but I assure you, you mistook his meaning: he could not but remark a Quaker expression [*commonly called*] and so much the rather, that there are many Presbyterians who industriously shun the giving any such Title; for these Academick Dissenters look so near the Whore of Babylon, that it is not safe for the Saints to use such words; and if the Dr. has any grains of Pride (which perhaps might be allowed in a Cadet of *Dumbarrow's* Regiment) yet his ambition runs in another Channel than to affect empty sounds and big words. I thought (and I think I know him better than you do) that a careless easiness rather than reserve, distance or singularity, made up his Character; the affectation of Titles at this time is very unsuitable to the Scotch Clergy, yet it is not in the power of might or malice to make some of them fawn upon the Presbyterians: and though we are obliged to forgive our Enemies heartily and sincerely, we must not be so abject as to encourage them to continue their Hostilities, but there is a greater impertinence in your Censure of the Dr;

for

when you made him to ride in the Popes Guard with a
 disinclination the many Crimes that he was guilty of at Rome,
 you conclude this, which methinks looks somewhat strange, that such
 kind of men should be the greatest saviours for the Party. If you
 represent the Party as odious and irreligious, and him of the same
 temper with the Party, what is there strange in this, that an ill
 man should defend an ill cause? but the most ordinary things ap-
 pear to you in your Dreams and Visions; Monsters, Miracles and
 Contradictions.

You are so sharp-sighted in discovering Contradictions, that
 you see them almost in every line; and because the Author of
 the *Reflexion* said, that Dr. Conar is was treated with special Ho-
 nour by a *Reverend* Judicature; therefore this is made a
 contradiction to what others say of them, that they are a *pru-
 dence, unchangeable Tribe*. But this is your everlasting mistake, that
 you do not understand what a Contradiction is. That they are a
prudence, unchangeable Tribe, is true in the sense, that all such pro-
 positions are understood, not in a *Logical universal sense*, but gene-
 rally speaking; the proudest Man upon Earth is not *wise and unchange-
 able* in all the intervals of his life; Madmen have their *lucid
 intervals*, and a wise Man may sometimes act foolishly. *Solomon*
says, that a *wise Man's heart is at his right hand*; yet the
 prevalence of his mind may sometimes forsake him, and he him-
 self was a sad instance of this Truth. His *Proverbs*, that are
wisely inspired, many of them are true in no other sense than
 in that of *experience*; and is, as you say, that the poor *Gentiles* should
 have no other employment now a days, than to dispute with
 such as know not the nature of a Contradiction; yet for your
 encouragement, I believe *George Stirling*, and *Harry Ferguson*
 may think you one of the learnedest men, of this age has pro-
 duced, and perhaps there is none beyond you, in their Opinion

Ibid.

ready. I should not be so quick at the sword as you are, if I
 Your quarrel against the Dr. is never at an end, and he ex-
 pects no fairer quarters at your hands. You are angry, it seems
 that he denied that *ever he rode in the Popes Guard*. He denies
 still, and his offer to prove this Negation as far as any thing
 of that nature can be proved, now he is full of the Opinion,
 that none knew him to have ridden in the *Popes Guard*, but
myself, who he discovered in the *Wall of the Moon*. This
 expression raises your indignation higher, because you say
 that; and I should not be so quick at the sword as you are, if I

Ibid.

it *but in it an impudent hint of denying the late Prelatical Plot against the Government.* And must he be impudent because he does not know the Plots against the Government? and how came you to know that there are no Plots in the *World of the Moon*? are you so well acquainted with the Inhabitants that you know exactly their times of Peace and War, the several Revolutions and Designs in that Country? for my part I know of no Plots against this or any other Government, and I never read your News-Letters and I think that the great and dangerous Plots of which no man is found guilty, are all of them in the *World of the Moon*. Presbyterians are so well acquainted with plotting, that some of them cannot forget it no more than a Jew can forget his Religion; they speak of Plots and Designs, they dream of them, they talk of them in all Companies; and if an innocent man stops aside to ask his Neighbour *what o'clock it is*, he is immediately found in a Plot by some Presbyterian Informer.

But now, Mr. Ridpath, you fall into a fit of Devotion; and you wish that the *Fallhoods* which have been mutually charged on one another, may oblige both to be more tender of publishing Reports upon each. Alas! Mr. Ridpath, is it come to this, that your acknowledgements there have been *Fallhoods* charged upon the Episcopal Party by the Presbyterians; no doubt a Man of your Tenderness and Sincerity regrets this infamous Practice; yet in the next Breath you tell us, that when this Doctor was Parson of ~~St. Andrew's~~ *St. Andrew's* *Village* with a Woman amongst the Corn. Such Stories are the very things that confirm me in the Opinion that your *Trick* is so very well acquainted in the *World of the Moon*. Where was he *at* when he was accused? by whom was he accused? who heard of this Accusation before your scurrilous Pamphlet appeared? You do not say positively that he was guilty. No; you let it sneakingly drop thro' your Fingers: so that the Question now between you and me is not whether he was guilty or not guilty; but whether he accus'd or not accus'd. The Affirmative part is yours, and if an honest Man had it by the end he would either prove it or retract it; the Negative is mine that *he was never accus'd*, and if none of them amongst whom he lived, in the most eminent places of the Nation ever heard that he was thus accus'd, none but an impudent Liar will affirm it.

But if you were to speak your last, you can freely declare that you do not know one Syllable of what you write to be false. At the rate, you may accuse him of all the Crimes that the Presbyterians invented against the Bishops in the Year 1628, as I have told you before when I mentioned the Archbishop of Glasgow; and of all

all the Crimes which your own Major *Wier* actually committed with *Mary, Cow* and *Gary*; not to name the Sisters that run with him from one Communion to another, for his extraordinary Gift of *extempore Prayer*; for after all, you may safely say, that you do not know them to be false; and if any should accuse Mr. *Ridpath* to have committed *Incest* with his Mother at *Cockburnspath*, before he went to the College of *Edinburgh*; I may safely say, that if I were to speak my last I do not know it to be false. And how should one know such *Negatives* in matter of Fact without Omniscience? and because you do not know such things to be false, you think you have liberty to spread and propagate romanick Lies, pure and unmixt Calumnies against particular Persons. Are these the Weapons by which you serve your Party? and do you think to impose upon the World by such *Bed-lam Fooleries*?

But tho the Dr. was not in the Pope's Guards, yet he was a *Cadet* in *Dumbarton's Regiment in France*, and there is no such odds, you think, between being a *Cadet in Dumbarton's Regiment*, which guarded *Papery* and constituted so much to enslave Europe, and rising in the Pope's Guards. Yes, Mr. *Ridpath*, there is very great odds, tho you do not see it, as much as there is between the Liberties of the *Gallican Church*, and the unlimited Supremacy of the Pope: and do you think that the King of France was fighting for *Papery*, when he wrested the ancient Rights of the *Regale* out of the possession of the *Roman Bishop*? But Mr. *Ridpath*, the Dr. was certainly in *Dumbarton's Regiment*, I assure you of it, and, which is much worse, he never thought shame of it. The strict Alliance between the liberal Sciences and Arms is a *Common-Place* too well known, and he is very sure, that neither Scholar nor Gentleman will ever reproach him upon this head; and his passing some of his time in France (the great Theatre of Breeding and Civility) was a more auspicious Omen of Piety and Humanity than the most remarkable Gallantries of your Life. *Plato* had strong Inclinations to follow the Camp when he was young, until he was diverted by the Advice of *Socrates*. I hear you sometimes teach *Grammar* (a Study in it self very commendable) why then do not you read our *Buchanan*,

Car. Coll. *Franciscus Marefch.* in *Jephth.* Traged. Præf. Absurdum fore esse rem fidere quibusdam videbor: qui ad ea, hominum ab ineunte ætate militaribus imbutum studiis, & inter arma tuba quo semper versatum munusculum hoc literarum institum: sed si forte hoc absurdum existimatur, sine qui aut parum rerum inter se consensum non sinit, adinadvertunt

* *Alian. Var. Hist.*

* *Ad Illu. striff. Vir.*

am

aut ingenium minus parum habens persequantur. Neque enim sicut res Naturae & literarum studium ea est, quam plerique falso putant discordia, sed summa potius concordia & occulta quaedam naturae conspiratio; quoniam enim superioribus aliquis (oculis sive hominum inertia sive falsa quadam persuasione divisa fuerunt haec professiones, nunquam tamen perversa imperitorum opinio tantum potuit ut ipsa inter se veterem illam & naturalem (ut ita loquar) cognationem obliuiscerentur.

not to name any of the Antients; and if nothing else must please you but the Example of a *Presbyterian* of the latest Edition, why may not I justify the Dr's Practice, when he was very young, from the Example of your Mr. *Williamson*, when he was old. I mean the celebrated Mr. *Williamson* whom all the Ladies flock'd to see from all the corners of the Court, when he delivered his Harangue before Queen *Mary*; for he was a Captain of Horse in the Rebellion

† Hist. of son at *Boiswell bridge*. And I think any *Cadit* in *Dumbarton's* the Consp. Regiment may, without Vanity, be compared to a Captain of the Rebellion at *Boiswell bridge*.

Ch. II p. g.
118.

And now that I mention Mr. *David Williamson*, I intreat him not to take it ill if I recommend the Censure of one part of your Preface to the Parliament, to himself; for amongst many other things with which you asperse the *Clergy of Scotland* that loquurn in *England*, this is one, that they roov about the Country with their *John Sermons*. Truly Mr. *Ridpath*, I do not know any one of them that preaches, except such as are provided with some Benefice in the Country, and I think that is no small part of their Disaster and Infelicity, so you cannot tell whether their Sermons are from or not. In some cases it is not only allowable to borrow but expedient; and if your Curiosity would engage you to read *St. Cyprian de Idolatorum Damnatione*, you would find that he hath several Sentences, nay the very turnings of Phrase, from *Mountain Patris*; and this argues his Love to the Author and to the thing rather than any Indigence of his own. If the *Curates* read good and solid Books and preach them to the People, why may not they be allowed to bring out of their *Treasure* things new and old. If the sparkish *Dew* in the Fable had only filled up the vacant places of her Wings with Feathers of her own kind, she had never been ridiculous; for we all of us acknowledge heartily that we borrow; but still we are from Birds of our own colour.

Continuat.
Pref. p. 10.

But Mr. *Ridpath*, I am to give an instance of an impudent Plagiarist, who lately before the *Presbyterian Parliament*, in a Sermon designed to abuse the whole Order of *Bishops*, borrows from

from

from * Bishop Brownrig, no less than about 16. or 17. Lines. I do not at all find fault with Mr. Williamson for reading Bishop Brownrig's Sermons, nor yet do I blame him for preaching them to the People; would to God he would preach none else, but to borrow so much from a *superfluous Sermon* preached at the Inauguration of King Charles I, a *Martyr for Prelacy*, and before my Lord Melvil, in a Discourse calculated to incense the Meeting against Prelacy, was truly becoming Mr. Williamson's Generosity: I do not declaim against his Stealing, for I am as much obliged to Bishop Brownrig as to any Book of that kind that ever I read. And this very Observation I have from another Curate who read Mr. Williamson's Sermon, and compared it with the place in Bishop Brownrig, whence he stole his most beautiful Feathers: and if the Members of Parliament had known, when they groaned under Mr. Williamson's powerful Preaching, that his smooth and nervous Conclusion, full of Laconick Majesty and Solidity, had been borrowed from a Bishop, they might think that such a Man as Brownrig was, was not altogether unworthy of Mr. Williamson's Conversation; and the plain truth is, it was a very hard thing to treat a Bishop as a Limb of Antichrist; when his own Jewels were borrowed to make such a Figure before the Parliament.

Next comes your Compliment to the Memory of my Lord Dumbarton, as an Evidence of your extraordinary Prudence and Caution. You know, that when your Book appeared my Lord Duke Hamilton was Commissioner to the Parliament, and then you expected the thorough Settlement of Presbytery, which now you have in *Folio*, by the late Act; and therefore it was not safe to reflect upon my Lord Dumbarton or his Regiment. But good Mr. Bidpath, speak out plainly, do you truly think that Persons of my Lord Duke Hamilton's Quality and Sense read such Pamphlets as yours; certainly you cannot be so mad, your Books are calculated for a lower order of Men, and the you sent some of them beyond Seas; yet they are only considered by such who never read any thing but nasty Pamphlets, and who now and then dream of Plots, and reason about them with the same profound Sense that you do when you cite your *Logic of Mankind*.

Now when you draw near to a Conclusion, you give the Dr. such a Blow, that he is not able to recover: for the Author of the Postscript said, that you began your *Title page with a Lie*, that your Book might be all of a piece. And this again provokes your

* Bishop Brownrig.
Serm. Lon.
Printed,
1664. Ser.
1. pag. 10.
compared
with Wil-
liamson's
Serm. Jun.
15. 1690.
pag 20.
* R. B.

Heroick Passion, and you load your Antagonist with some of the
 most odious Reproaches that your Dictionary could furnish you
 with. But, Mr. *Ridpath*, what was it that he said? why, he said
 that your Book was not printed for *Tho. Anderson* near *Charing-
 Cross*, and you charge him upon credit, to prove that it was not
 printed for him. And must you never be cured of this imperti-
 nence, that you oblige your Adversary to prove a *Negative* in a
 matter of Fact? and then to make your ignorance the more con-
 spicuous, you guard your desire with a *Logical Axiom*, *affirmantis
 incumbit probatio*. I am ashamed of you, that you do not know
 the difference between an *Affirmative* and a *Negative Proposition*;
 when he said that it was not printed for *Tho. Anderson* near *Char-
 ing-Cross*, he affirmed nothing; and if he called you a Liar, al-
 though such a Proposition sounded like an *Affirmative*, yet it was
 no *affirmative Proposition*, but finally resolved into a *Negative*; and
 can no other wise be proved than as a *Negative* may; and since
 he could meet with no Bookseller near *Charing-Cross*, who knew
 any such man of their Trade, might not he reasonably presume
 that your *Title-page* had a Lye in the bosom of it; notwithstanding
 all this it may be true that your Book was printed for him,
 and that he lives in some dark Vault near *Charing-Cross*. Such a
 thing is possible, though it be not very probable that a Book-
 seller should hide himself under ground; for that is not their
 ordinary way of selling Books. I insist on this only to chastise
 your ignorance, and vanity, when you darken the whole Men-
 sphere with Dust, out comes your *affirmantis incumbit probatio*,
 as if your Adversary had the *Affirmative* that ought to be
 proved. But I insist on this only to chastise your ignorance, and vanity.
 You are so foolishly vain, that if all the particular Paragraphs
 of your first Book have not been considered, you conclude that
 your Adversary was convinced of their truth and solidity. The
 Error that I, just now named, brings to my mind another
 piece of fulsome ignorance of the same nature with the
 former. You may meet with it in the place cited on the
 Margin. Your Antagonist loaded the *Presbyterians* with in-
 consistencies, and particularly he exposed your doctrine and foo-
 leries concerning anniversary Days, and he might do so with the
 greater safety, because you still retain something in your pra-
 ctice which overthrows your Principles: for you celebrate the
 great Charities of *George Herriot* by an Anniversary commemora-
 tion:

Answ. to
 the Scotch
 Eloq.
 pag. 53

tion: *Ergo* (says he) you are not against anniversary Solemnities. But you confute this argument very learnedly, and you prove from clear Scripture that *Anniversaries are unlawful*, because the fourth Commandment lays positively, *Six days shalt thou work*; *Ergo*, you conclude, that all *Anniversary* Solemnities are unlawful. Now Mr. *Ridpath*, let us calmly consider the strength of your argument. All men are obliged by this Precept in the sense that you put upon it, or they are not; if all are obliged (as no doubt they are) by what dispensation are they of *Herriot's foundation* exempted? and if particular Societies be exempted, why may not the whole Nation pretend an exemption? for one Society is no more privileged than another, and if all Societies may equally pretend an exemption, why may it not be granted to the whole Kingdom, which is but the political aggregate of so many Societies? For, if they of *Herriot's Hospital* may celebrate an *Anniversary*, why may not all the Inhabitants of *Edinburgh* do it? But you fortify your Opinion by a *Logical Axiom*, *Ex particulari non fit Generalis*, which you think signifies, that we must not draw precedents from the allowable practice of particular Societies; and this is the Philosophy that you make such a noise with, whereas every Boy in the second Class that does not deserve whipping, can tell you that the meaning of that *Logical Rule* is, that *either of the premisses, or least must be an universal Proposition*, whether affirmative or negative: for two particular propositions cannot bear the weight of a conclusion, no more than two Negatives. Now tell me sincerely whether the making such a noise with *Logical Rules*, when you do not understand what they mean be not Nonsense and pedantry, in all their poms and formalities. If the practice of *Herriot's Hospital* were to be defended by argument, the patrons of it would reason from the religious practice of all other Societies, the rules of gratitude, and the constitutions of the place, and a conclusion regularly deduced from such principles is not I hope *ex particulari*, as you ignorantly fancy. But not to trifle with you any more, the answer to your argument is contain'd in that short, but undeniable *Axiom* received by all Divines, *Præcepta affirmativa obligant semper, sed non ad semper*; and we may work six days, *nisi interveniat feriacionis causa legitima, auctoritate divina vel humana stabilita*. Pray Mr. *Ridpath*, forgive all this *Latine*; for I do not think that the speaking of *Latine* is at all times pedantry, and many are apt to let that

that pass for pedantick which they do not understand; but if the phrase, of your infectious Breath, be the Word that provoked the Severity of your Censure, the Dr. in all Humility retracts it; for tho' your Breath be putrid; yet the Contagion spreads no further than People of your own Complexion, Men sufficiently infected before you breath'd upon them.

Mr. Ridpath, I do not pretend that this Treatise is methodical, and therefore I take no other Care to methodize my Animadversions on your Book, than as they tumble into my Fancy, I lie open to the censure of your *Hieron-Proseron* as oft as you please. Your Dedication to the *Scotch Parliament* is as considerable as the Book it self, for being the only Book that was dedicated to them, it contains your own grave and serious Advice how to manage the publick Affairs. Next you fall upon the poor Dr. and he must be lash'd and chastis'd for his Rashness and Precipitancy, because he presumed to give such an account of your first Book: but since you paint him as an *Ass* at the very beginning, why was you at so much pains with him? so mean a Creature was below a Man of your Elevation; and since you can defame and expose *Crowned Heads, Dukes, Earls, and Prelates*, why all this Noise to run down a poor *Hermite*. Your very first Blow hath in it so much Life and Wit, that one of his cold and phlegmatick Temper can never reach it, *As Postscript is Answer to the First.*

In the second Page of your *Continuation* there is a Catalogue of the most tragical Stories, made up to justify all the Bitterness and Buffoonry of your former Pamphlet. You justify the Severity of your Style by the Answer of a *Tinker*. And truly if all the Parts of your Book had been equally pertinent, it had been the best *Presbyterian Farce* that appeared since its late Erection: but because I would let you understand that our Registers of Fanatick Cruelties, Rebellions and Perjuries are as exact as the Legends of your imaginary Grievances, I will set down eight Particulars in an opposite Column to your eight, and then we have sixteen.

I. As long as we remember the Tumultuous Meetings, Rebellious Proteftations, and the bloody Confequences of the Presbyterian Covenants and Affociations, the Murder of our King, whom they tied Neck and Heels, until their Confederates brought him to the Scaffold, the Miferies of an intestine War, the Taxes, Contributions and Free-quarter impoſed by the Arbitrary Power of rebellious Subjects and mock Parliaments, the Multitude of Errors, Heresies and Dreams, that were proclaimed from our Pulpits, ſo long we remember that their Principles were inconfiſtent with the Royal Pre-rogative, our antient Conſtitution, as well as the Primitive Order of the Chriſtian Church.

II. As long as we remember that the firſt Covenanters had all ſworn the Oaths of Canonical Obedience to their reſpective Biſhops in their ſeveral Dioceſes, and that they diſpenſed with the ſaid Oath of Canonical Obedience in their General Aſſembly (*An. 1638. Seſſ. 13. Dec. 5.*) and forgot their Allegiance to their natural Lord and Sovereign, and impoſed their Babel Covenant on all in the moſt tyrannical manner,

Ridpath.

I. *While the Memory of King Charles II. and King James VII. endures, and till Time, the Conſumer of all things, hath eat up their Parliament Rolls, it will hold an undeniable Truth, that the Prelatical Party of Scotland are Perſecutors, and that in denying the ſame they have made themſelves notorious Liars.*

Ridpath.

II. *So long as it appears by the ſame Acts, that they impoſed a contradictory Teſt, ſo long will it hold that they are perjured themſelves, and chargeable with the Penalty of Oaths.*

and

and that to this day they continue to declaim against the legal securities of our Religion and Constitution as contradictory to it self; so long we must be excused to say that Presbyterians have no rule of Faith, but the Covenant, nor no Standard of Morals but the Practices of their rebellious Predecessors.

III. So long as we can remember that the Western Bigots and Incendiaries blew up the People into such mad Fancies, that they laid the whole stress of their Salvation upon their Zeal to promote the Covenant, and taught them to resist their lawful Sovereign, and to proclaim War against him, and printed Books to justify the most barbarous Assassinations ; so long we may conclude that the People who are led by such Guides are in a most miserable Condition ; and as long as we retain the exercise of Reason, and the Sense of Self-preservation, so long our Governors must be commended, who guarded against the Dangers that threatened us under their Administrations ; and so long as Men love their Peace, Constitution and Comfort, so long they must endeavour by the supereminent Law and first Prin-

I. As long as we remember
the Tenthousand Meetings,
the bloody Consequences of
the Presbyterian Covenant
and Abominations the Murder
of our King, whom they shed
Black and Hells, and their
Confederates brought him to
the scaffold, the Members of an
Kidpath.

III. So long as it remains in the Records of Council, that they ordered Men to be killed without any Tryal or colour of Law, or so much as with an Exception, whether they refused or not refused, so long will it hold that they are blam'd Murderers.

Order of the Christian Church. tion, as well as the Primitive negative, our ancient Confes- consistent with the Royal Pre- that their Principles were in-

II. As long as we remember that the first Covenanters had all from the Order of Canon-Give Bishops in their respect, and that they differed with the last Order of Canonical Obsequies in their Canonical Obsequies, (the 1st of Dec. 7.) and in their regard to their mutual land and foreign, and in their their Royal Covenant on all the most essential matters.

ciple of all Societies, to teach Sanguinary Rebels to feel the Effects of their open Villanies and Conspiracies.

IV. As long as there are any Records of that Mock-Assembly preserved, the World may be easily satisfied, by their Impertinent Queries and Disobedience to the King's Order, of their Tyranny and Ambition, and their Lording it over others, who, by their Confession are their Equals in Power and Jurisdiction, and that by divine right, and yet they suspend the Exercise of that Power which is conferred by divine Right, by virtue of an Act of Parliament, which I hope they do not think to be of any thing more than Human Authority.

V. As long as such blasphemous Nonsense as the *Decretum pradamatum*, and the *Decretum practeritum*, are to be seen and read in the Writings of their greatest Champions; so long they are justly charged with Nonsense and Blasphemy. *Vid. Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland. pag. 66.*

Ridpath.

IV. So long as the Records of the last General Assembly of the Church of Scotland remain, it will appear by their Evasions, Answers, and disingenuous refusals to declare their Abhorrence of Arminianism, Socinianism, and Popery, that they are Firebrands in the Church, and Incendiaries in the State.

Ridpath.

V. So long as any of their villainous Libels, called the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, exist, wherein they charge Holness with Deformity, God with horrid Deceits, and mock at Seriousness and Piety, so long will it be evident that they are Blasphemers.

H

VI. The

VI. The Address of the Bishops of Scotland, before the Revolution, to the King, contained nothing but what was agreeable to the publick Prayers used in behalf of the King in both Nations; and Mr. Ridpath knows that the other Branch of this Particular must not be touched; yet as long as the Act of the *West Kirk*, and the *Remonstrance* in the Year 1650, (not to name preceding Papers of the same Nature, and Acts of the General Assembly in the year 1648) are preserved; so long the Presbyterian Principles are known to be subversive of all *Kingly Power*, and destructive to all *Allegiance*, and the Rights of *Sovereignty*.

VII. So long as the Acts of your *Rebellious Parliaments* from 1639 to 1649, and the Acts of your *Assemblies* in 1648 and 1649 continue upon record, and your zealous Preachers importuning the Committee of Estates in person, to execute the King's most faithful Servants, so long the World may be informed of Presbyterian Spite and Malice.

*Guth.
MSS.

Ridpath.

VI. So long as that *Scurrilous Address* of their Bishops against the Prince of Orange, their opposing him in Parliament, their refusing to pray for him, or swear to him now he is King, and the legal procedure against them on the said accounts are on record; so long it will appear that they are *Rebels*.

Ridpath.

VII. So long as their bloody Acts of Parliament, and barbarous Execution of those Acts against us, and our gentle Acts of Parliament, and moderate Execution of those Acts against them, are upon record, so long it will appear that they are *infamous Liars*, in asserting that we treat them more *barbarously* than they treated us.

VIII. As

and foot to maintain of the Presbyterian of the West of Scotland. *Ridpath*

VIII. As long as the West of Scotland continues unreformed from barbarous Principles, so long they are a Plague to the Nation, and a Reproach to the Protestant Religion. This is only understood of such of them as deserve this Character.

Before I take leave of you, I must put the Reader in mind of one Argument by which you endeavour to fully the Reputation of such of the Bishops as voted in the late Convention, before the King's Letter to them was opened, that *They were a free and lawful Meeting, notwithstanding of any Order that might be contained in that Letter to dissolve them*; from this you conclude, that they were inconsistent with their own Principles and after Practices. And the truth is, if they intended by that Vote nothing less than what the Presbyterian Party advanced, *they were inconsistent with their Principles*; but tho' they concurred in that Vote, they took the Words *a free and lawful meeting*, not to signify any Meeting of the People contrary to the King's Prerogative, Authority, and standing Laws; but rather a Meeting to support all the three, and they were to sit notwithstanding of a Prohibition, until such time as they could duly inform the King of the Straits and Difficulties that they were involved in: Necessity made them bow under the Weight of that Opposition that they wrestled with; and they hoped that a Vote might be forgiven, which their Practices would have vindicated from any Suspicion of lessening the Royal Authority. But Mr. *Ridpath*, did you never hear of a Merchant throwing overboard his Goods in a Storm, his Principle is (no doubt) to preserve and improve his Stock, yet when Life, and Ship, and all is in hazard, Silver and Gold, and the best Cargo that he is Master of, must be flung over. Men sometimes, in the Simplicity of their Hearts, may yield to some publick Acts in a time of Danger and Confusion, which, in their own Nature and Tendency are inconsistent with their Principles; the wisest Men may sometimes mistake their measures, and the presence of one's Mind does not perpetually attend him.

is not one of your party in *Scotland*, that truly and sincerely represents the Opinions of *St. Jerome*: nay more expressly I offer to make evident from the writings of *St. Jerome*, that *Episcopacy* was established by the *Apostles*, and that he never dream'd of any such period of the Church wherein the parity of *Presbyters* prevailed after the death of the *Apostles*. And if you must write Books, you ought to come out from behind the *Curtains*, and let us know where your Bookseller may be found, and by whom they are Licensed, and take the assistance of all your Fraternity, read all the Books that you think defend your Cause to the best advantage, and let us plainly hear what grounds you have to assert, that your new and upstart Discipline is founded upon *divine Right*; and why the Ministers of the *Episcopal* persuasion are turned out, if they do not solemnly promise

* Vid. Act of Parl. for settling the peace of the Church, *Edinburgh*, June 12. 1693.

never directly nor indirectly * to alter an Ecclesiastical Government, which can no more be reconciled to the former constitution of *Presbytery*, than to the Word of God, the Canons of the Universal Church, and the practice of the first Ages of Christianity. And let us know if ever Clergymen were turned out of their Livings upon their denying to make any such promise, since the name of *Christian* was heard in the World: and do not run up and down, and make a noise as if I opposed an Act of Parliament, I only dispute against the Opinions of blind Zealots, who have no more regard to the peace of the Nation, than they have to the Order of *Episcopacy*.

Mr. *Ridpath*, If you are as resolute as you are clamorous, you cannot but think it reasonable to appear, for no man is obliged to consider fullsome Lampoons, no accusations ought to be heard against any man (far less against *Kings, Dukes, and Prelates*) unless the accuser openly pawn his reputation to prove the Crimes fairly before a competent Judicature. There are many things in both your Books that I have not mentioned, yet I am ready to prove that they are less material and more ridiculous than those I have named; for I know no man so pusillanimous as to turn his back upon you for fear of any harm that you can do him, and therefore I set down the initial Letters of name and surname, and that in Mr. *Rule's Latine*, makes up *Totum Nomen*: and there are a great many here who know me, though at present I neither wear the Doctoral Scarf or Canonical Habit. I have hitherto treated you with all Civility, though there be none alive has fewer Engagements or Obligations to continue,

Mr. *Ridpath*,
Your humble Servant.

S. W.

POSTSCRIPT.

Mr. Ridpath,

THE following *Certificates and Letter* came to my hands from *Scotland*, not until the former Sheets were wrought off, else they had been set down in their proper places, to which they are more immediatly related. The first is under the Hands of so many honest Inhabitants of *Leith*, in favours of Mr. *Andrew Cant* sometime their Minister; and it fully and plainly disproves and overthrows the Original and Fundamental Libel propagated by your self, and your Informers, against him, viz. That *He was suspended from the exercise of his Ministry*: and therefore the other Fabulous accounts that you raise upon this Calumny, must necessarily fall to the Ground. It is not possible to prove *Negatives* in a Matter of Fact otherwise, than when they who ought to know the thing in Controversie, declare upon *Honor and Conscience*, that there never was any such things; and if the Course of his Ministry had been interrupted by any Sentence, how easily might this be prov'd; nay how impossible had it been to have deny'd it, since in so numerous a Parish, so near the Centre of the Nation, their would have been so many Witnesses of so recent a Transaction.

[Skippin]

Thomas Ridpath

[Machan]

J. Balfour

[Machan]

T. Pennick

We

[Skippin]

J. Machan

James

We whose Names are underwritten, (Inhabitants of Leith)
do by these presents declare upon Honor and Conscience,
that Mr. Andrew Cant, (sometime our Minister) was
never discharged the Exercise of his Office (by any Sen-
tence, Ecclesiastical or otherwise) amongst us, but on the
contrair, continued very diligent and painful therein,
for the space of eight years or thereby, after which time
he was preferred to be one of the chief Ministers of the
City of Edinburgh.

Sic Subscribitur.

Jo. Brone,	[Skipper.]
Ja. Hutcheson,	[Notar Publick.]
John Burton,	[Baker.]
Alex. Robertson,	[Wine-Cooper.]
James Cunningham,	[Wine-Cooper.]
Patrick Smith,	[Wine-Cooper.]
John Wilson,	[Wine-Cooper.]
Thomas Riddell,	[Skipper.]
Ja. Balfour,	[Merchant.]
T. Fenwick,	[Maltman.]
Jo. Muchmutie,	[Skipper.]

James

James Johnston, [Wright (or Joyner.)]

Rob. Herdman, [Maltman.]

Robert Bowy, [Wine Cooper.]

Ge. Farquhar, [Maltman.]

Andrew Fairservice, [Carter.]

Gen. Davidson, [Maltman.]

George Albereromby, [Maltman.]

J. D. [James Dow, Tailor.]

J. W. [James Walker (as I took it) Mason.]

The two last could subscribe no otherwise being illiterate but very Honeft. I have subjoyn'd to this *Certificate* a Letter to one of his Friends in *London*, occasion'd by your falſome and unchristian Libels against him.

Worthy Sir,

Ever since I came to mans years, I have been very sensible that we live here in the Neighbourhood of a Sullen sett of People, that can never think themselves secure of any measure of Reputation, unless they raise it upon the Ruins of the good Name of innocent Men that are not of their Opinion in every thing, and am farther confirmed in this Thought by a late instance in what concerns me personally, in a slanderous Pamphlet in-
I subscribed,

scribed, *An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Answer*, was some months in this place before I could procure a sight of it; but when I had seen it, the thoughts I had concerning what I am wickedly Libelled of, were not so full of Anger as Disdain, to find an obscure, sorry John anapes (for so he must be) attacking me with so much Malice and arrant Calumny, though I was living very peaceably as I have always done without being the Aggressor of any Person or Party. At first I was resolved to slight it, as a thing that can never do me harm with any one that knows me; yet upon second thoughts, and to satisfy a worthy Friend of mine, I give you the trouble of this line, which bears such short answers to the ill-natur'd and curst accusations of that infamous Libeller, as I think sufficient.

First, Then he endeavours to vilifie and belie me, by saying I was an Underling, an Leith. What he meaneth by this I know not, the true matter is, that the first appearance I made in my *Scotch Office* was as second Minister of *Leith*, to which I came regularly by a Presentation from the Patrons, and Collation thereupon from the Discreet. I cannot apprehend any disparagement in the thing, and I am sure I have yet a very great kindness from all that People, excepting a few Bigots, and of very little interest. Next I remember he will needs have the World believe, that I Preached very odd things to the People, but has not so much as given one instance, not for want of Malice, but (it seems) diversion, in the particular. My poor gift of Preaching the Holy Gospel was but small, yet I bless God I am not ashamed of it, and I hope I have something of the power of those Divine Truths I declar'd to the World on my own Heart, and Seals of them upon the Hearts of others; but if this railing Fellow doubt I be competently qualified, let him procure me Liberty and Salary I will not decline to Preach before the General Assembly.

In

' In another passage of that Pamphlet, this Silly Fellow
 ' charges me with being a notable *Brawler*, and for proof
 ' says, I was Suspended for sometime from the Exercise of
 ' my Office for beating of a *Highlander*. To let you see
 ' what Impudence is in this Contrivance, I send you here
 ' with inclosed a Copy of a Declaration, under the Hands
 ' of some of the honest Neighbours in *Leith*, bearing, that
 ' I was never Suspended the Exercise of my Office during my
 ' abode with them, and if it were necessary, I doubt not but
 ' I can easily obtain the attestation of all that are yet alive
 ' of them I left in the place. 'Tis hard that I should be
 ' obliged after fifteen years time to give them the trouble of
 ' attesting my innocence against the snarlings of a rank-
 ' mouth'd *Curr*: but I have done it very easily. Now this
 ' being made appear a manifest lye, with a witness, there is
 ' no place left to suppose I made use of any method for
 ' returning to my Office which I never left, far less such im-
 ' pious and silly ones, as he says, and would have believed
 ' I did, and are not worth the mentioning, being such as I
 ' fancy no man on Earth, (though of less heighth of Natural
 ' Temper than I, and almost of equal Villany with the scurri-
 ' lous Author) could be guilty of; but was it not a Lucky
 ' thing that this mettled Spark charged me not with the Cri-
 ' minous Sins of Bestiality, Incest and Sorceries? Certainly
 ' he had not failed of it, if they had not been Vertues pecu-
 ' liar to the Saintship of one of his Friends, who was pub-
 ' lickly burnt betwixt *Edinburgh* and *Leith*, upon confes-
 ' sion of the foresaid Crimes, in my sight and some thousands
 ' besides.

' In some other part, he charges me with Robbing off a
 ' thousand Marks *Scots* money, from *William Carsfey* who
 ' came to pay me my Stipend due by the Town of *Edin-*
 ' *burgh*. I shall never think it worth my Pains to offer a
 ' Justification of my self from so ridiculous a Story: the
 ' young man lives still in the City, and is so Just and

' Honest to declare to some of my acquaintance that it is a
 ' most notorious Lye; but Innocence it self cannot be secure
 ' against hellish Impudence. There is one thing more in his
 ' Paper, (not worth the minding indeed) which I had almost
 ' forgot, *viz.* That I was, at the time of his Writing, a Va-
 ' gabond at London; if a Man must be branded with this
 ' Character for going from one place to another, he has
 ' been much longer a Vagabond than I, as I am told, and I
 ' am sure for his bloody uncharitableness, deserves the mark
 ' of a second *Cain*, and the Character of another *Accuser of*
 ' *the Brethren*, having been made very skilful in the Art of
 ' Lying, by his Father, who has used it since the beginning.
 ' I leave this Letter intirely to your disposal: I ask your
 ' pardon for this trouble, and am with all respect,
 ' Sir, Your affectionate faithful,
 ' *Edinburgh,*
 ' July 29. 1693.

Your humble Servant,
 Andrew Cant.

' THE next *Certificate* is in favours of Dr. Alexander
 ' *Monro*, and it serves the end for which it is publish'd.
 ' You say that when he was in *Scotland*, he was so and so
 ' accus'd as is narrated in the following *Certificate*. If this
 ' had been true, there is no doubt to be made but that Per-
 ' sons of Honour, Sense, and Interest, in the Cities of *Edin-*
 ' *burgh* and *St. Andrews* would have heard of it, especially
 ' since he was preferr'd to such places as would provoke
 ' Rivals and Competitors. And is it to be believ'd, that
 ' the least surmise of that Nature could have escaped the In-
 ' dustry

dultry of the *Presbyterians*, who scrupled not to pretend
 'to the knowledge of his very Thoughts without any ex-
 'ternal Evidence? I have often told you that *Negatives* in
 'a Matter of Fact are not otherwise to be prov'd: 'Tis no
 'wonder that so malicious an Accuser should mistake Truth
 'for Falshood, and Falshood for Truth, when you have
 'not yet attain'd to so much Sense, as to distinguish between
 'an *Affirmative* and a *Negative* Proposition. You are firmly
 'resolv'd to defame and disparage the Episcopal Clergy at
 'any rate, and that hath occasion'd the following Evidence
 'of your Candor and Veracity.

Whereas Dr. Alexander Monro (late Principal of Edin-
 burgh College) is said in an impertinent Libel, Enti-
 tuled, A Continuation of the Answer to the Scotch-
 Presbyterian Eloquence, to have been accused when he
 was in Scotland of being found with a Woman among
 the Corn, We whose names are under written, (living in
 and near to the City of Edinburgh) do by these presents
 declare upon Honor and Conscience that we never heard
 that he was so accused, and that if any such Accusation
 had ever been invented against him, We think it very
 probable that we would have heard of it, especially
 since so narrow an inquisition has been made into his Life
 and Actions in the beginning of the Late Revolution,
 when for Non-Compliance he was turned out of the Col-
 lege of Edinburgh.

Sic Subscribitur.

W. Binning:

{ Sir William Binning of Wallinford,
 { late Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

J. Dick.

{ Sir James Dick of Priestfield, late
 { Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

Tho.

Tho. Kennedy, } *Sir Thomas Kennedy of Kirk-Hill,*
 } *late Lord Provost of Edinburgh.*

John Marjoribanks, [*Late Bailiff of Edinburgh.*]

Ja. Henryson, [*Writer to the Signet there.*]

John Baillie, [*Apothecary and Chirurgeon there.*]

Robert Clerk, [*Apothecary and Chirurgeon there.*]

A. Skene, } *Alexander Skene, D. D. Late Pro-*
 } *vost of the old College in the*
 } *Univerfity of St. Andrews.*

Ri. Waddell, } *Richard Waddell, D. D. Late Arch-*
 } *Deacon of St. Andrews.*

A. Macleod, [*Mr. Alexander Macleod, Advocate.*]

James Flemyeng, } *Sir James Flemyeng of Ratho-byres,*
 } *late Lord Provost of Edinburgh.*

A. Balfour, } *Sir Andrew Balfour, Doctor of Me-*
 } *dicine.*

Ar. Stevenson, } *Sir Archibald Stevenson, Doctor of*
 } *Medicine.*

Will. Monipenny, [*Mr. William Monipenny, Advocate.*]

T. Skene, [*Mr. Thomas Skene, Advocate.*]

C. Gray, [*Mr. Charles Gray, Advocate.*]

Al. Craufurd,

Al. Craufurd,[*Mr. Alexander Craufurd, Advocate.*]*Mr. Mackenzie,*[*Mr. John Mackenzie, one of the
Clerks of Session.*]*Du. Mackintosh,*[*Late Bailiff in Edinburgh.*]*Æn. Macleod,*[*Town-Clerk.*]*J. Wedderburn,*[*Mr. John Wedderburn, Clerk of
the Bills.*]*Al. Gibson,*[*One of the Clerks of the Session.*]*Mr. Ridpath,*

I would have gladly taken leave of you long before
 now, but that I am not left at liberty as to the follow-
 ing Letter. It is occasioned by your own Civilities to
 the Archbishop of Glasgow and others. We oppose the
 Publick Records of the Nation to your Clamorous and Ob-
 scene Labels; and if there were nothing else to prove the
 madness of your Temper than that one Story of *Margaret
 Purvison*, we need no other proof to convince the World
 of your desperate Impudence.

*A Letter from a Gentleman in Scotland to his Friend
in London. Edinburgh, July 22. 1693.*

Sir,

I Had not yours till last Night, which lets you see
that it hath been a month by the way, and this is
the true Reason your return is so late.

As to that silly Varlet *Ridpath*, all I can say of him
more than yours to me contains, which I know to be
most exact Truth, is, that being apprehended and made
Prisoner here about *Christmas* 1686, for contriving and
writing a Bond of Combination, or kind of Association,
for burning the *Pope* in *Effigie*, which you know was a
folly never before that time attempted here, and was de-
signed then by the Rogues of this City: particularly
the Presbyterians, as an indignity to his (then) *Royal
Highness*. This Bond being found in the custody of this
Villain by the diligence of the Learned and Reverend
Dr. Cant (then) Principal of King James his University of
Edinburgh (who though he was a Celebrated Champion
for the Protestant Church, yet had he a just indignation a-
gainst all Rabbling and Tumults.) This Bond, I say, is now
in the Council Office, and I have often seen and read it. 'Tis
indeed a young League and Covenant, containing a Clause
of Mutual Defence, not excepting the King, or any in Au-
thority under him; and an invitation to Prentices, and all
others to joyn in this their Association. Now a Bond of
this Nature is by many Laws and Acts of Parliament de-
clared Treason; and that, not only since the dreadful ef-
fects of the Infamous League and Covenant, but even
by

by very old Acts in the Reigns of King James the First, and Second, So much for this. This Scoundrel was committed, who was not then a Boy, but a Fellow come to Years, and then a Servant to two Sons of one Gray, a person living on the English Border, and of the same Gang with his Man Ridpath.

The Fellow confess'd before the Committee of Council, that he had drawn this Bond, but would not own that he had been prompted to it, or assisted in it by others, though the Council well knew, that many of the Ringleaders of the Party were the promoters of this Trick, which was design'd as a Prologue to a Rebellion against the (then) Government. For this Villany the Law here might have justly sent him to the Gibbet, and perhaps the Council had put him in the hands of the Judges Criminal, had he not been preserv'd by the unparallel'd Clemency of the Prince, that (then) sat at the Helm here, which you know is so natural to that Sacred Race. I remember the Duke of Rohes the Chancellor, and several other great Lords, having examin'd him, and finding him very false and obstinate in his Answers, ordered him to be committed Close Prisoner till he were further examin'd. And as he was going to Prison, seeing a Crowd about him, and considering them as a Rabble, he cry'd out aloud, that he was suffering for the Protestant Religion, the ordinary, but false pretence of all Seditions and Rebellions here. For which he was for some days put in irons, and a little after by the Goodness of his (then) Royal Highness, who was always too compassionate to that Generation of Vipers, he was dismissed. This is all I can remember or learn of this Creature.

I hear in his late Pamphlet, which I have not yet seen, he has the Impudence to say, that one Margaret Pater-son (a Prostitute sufficiently infamous) should have confess'd somewhat before the Criminal Court relating to the

Archbishop of *Glasgow* and me; I am satisfied that all that that Villain has scribled of the Bishop be believed, if ever she named either the Bishop or me in her Confessions, either before that Court, or any Confessions else, whether publick or private. Nor did the Bishop hear of such a Creature, till the noise was made at her being taken naked in the Bed with the late *Presbyterian Moderator Kennedy* his two Sons, for which they stand declared Fugitives in the *Justice Court* Books, for the horrid Crime of Incest.

As to what relates to the *C—ks*, I make you this distinct Return. In the year 1684, *Sir Hugh* and *Sir George Campbells* of *C—k*, with *Baylie* of *Jerviswood*, *Commissar Monro*, *Mr. William Spence*, *Mr. William Carstairs*, and some others were sent down Prisoners here by Sea, and were kept close for some Weeks; during which time I had occasion to be often with them, for the Council ordered any of their Friends to converse with them, and see them, in presence of any of the Clerks of Council; and such of them as are yet alive, and their Relations will bear me witness, that I was as easie to them that way as they could desire. For, the truth is, they all professed so much Innocence in the matter they were accused of, (which was for being in a Conspiracy with the late *Monmouth* and *Argyle* for raising a Rebellion in both Nations at the same time, and which fell out the next year accordingly) and that with all the circumstantiated Imprecations to them and their Families, that I began to believe the Government had been imposed upon in this matter, and contracted such a compassion for them, as made some of our then *Statesmen* angry with me: and yet *Carstairs* upon the first application of the Thumb-Screw, even the first touch of it, confessed all, as may be seen in his Printed Confession in the Tryal of *Jerviswood*; and then *Monro*, and afterwards the two *C—ks* themselves; which

• which two *Campbells* were upon their Judicial Confession
 • forfeaulted in plain Parliament 1685, and their Estates
 • annex'd to the Crown: tho the King gave them not only
 • both Remissions for their Lives, but even ordered their
 • Estates to be returned to them, upon their paying a very
 • inconsiderable Composition to some of the then *State-men*.
 • That which the Rascal *Ridpath* aims at, I suppose, is a
 • Process which was commenced some time before that, a-
 • gainst old *C——k*: the undisguised matter of Fact was
 • truly this, which you may rely upon for certain and re-
 • corded Truth.

• There was one *Wallace* a Collector or Surveyor in *Air-*
shire. This Man gives Information to the Secret Com-
 • mittee, that there were three Men in that Country who
 • had assured him that old *C——k* had encouraged several
 • Country People to the Rebellion at *Birkwell Bridge*,
 • 1679; and that particularly he had said to themselves
 • whom he rencountred with upon a place, called the
 • Bridge of *Gastoun*, near his own House, *What meant such*
 • *young lusty Fellows to stay at home, when the People of God*
 • *were in Arms for their Covenanted Cause*; and bid them go
 • on to the rest (the Whig Army being then at *Hamilton*,
 • within ten Miles or thereby to that place) for he and the
 • rest of the Country would quickly be with them. Upon
 • which Information the three Fellows are brought in, and
 • kept some time in the *Cannon-gate Prison*. I heard them
 • examined before the Secret Committee, and all of them
 • both jointly and separately were very positive, clear, and
 • distinct in their Depositions. Upon this an Indictment
 • is raised against *C——k*, and the same Witnesses are again
 • examined upon Oath before the *Justices*, which is called
 • by our Law a *Precognition*, and there they were again very
 • firm, and seemed altogether clear and sincere. But the
 • Day of the Tryal being come, and a disaffected Crowd
 • getting in about these Witnesses, when they came to de-

'pone they began to waver much, and upon the matter de-
 ny much of what they had twice clearly made oath of
 before; so that the Jury brought in C——k not guilty;
 and so he was acquitted from that Indictment. And the
 next day the same three Rogues begged to be heard before
 the Council, where I heard them again upon their Knees,
 and with all the Solemnities of Truth and Sincerity, Pro-
 test and Swear, that what they had first Sworn was simple
 Truth, and that their Carriage the day before in the
 Court, was occasioned by their being terrified to swear
 against C——k, so great a Man in that Corner of the
 Country. But upon the whole Matter, the worthy Sir
 George Mackenzie had no more hand in all this Affair, but
 merely to pursue as the King's Advocate. And in general
 I can affirm, as in the sight of the God of Justice and Truth,
 I do believe, after all the Enquiry I have made, that ne-
 ver a person suffered in Scotland by Subornation or false
 Witnesses employed by the Government since the Restora-
 tion of the Royal Family. Tho many of the Rebels have
 been brought off, and absolved by the scandalous and bare-
 faced Perjuries of their own Party; for in the Tryals of
 those Rebels, the Witnesses for the King being formerly
 engaged in the saids Rebellions, made use of such strange
 and uncouth Fetches and Strains of Words, that no Jury
 could fix any Verdict or Doom upon; for being interro-
 gated, if they saw the person at the Barr in Arms with
 the Rebels (as particularly in the case of one Sprenkel, an
 eminent Ringleader, and Captain, several of his own
 Kinsmen as well as Acquaintances, and who had ridden
 under his Command), they were brought with great diffi-
 culty to confess, that they thought they had seen a Man there
 which seemed to be somewhat like the Prisoner at the
 Bar, but for a World they could not swear, that this Pri-
 soner was the person they saw there. Being ask'd, if he
 had a Sword; they answered, they saw that person have
 something

• something like the end of a Scabbard, hanging from under his Cloak, but whether there were a Blade there or not they could not tell, and being question'd on oath all the while if that person had Pistols; they confessed they had seen something like *Huffer-Cases* at his Saddle, but whether there were Pistols in them or not, they could not swear for a World. And by such Presbyterian Canning Perjuries as these, this *Speech*, and many others were brought off.

Dear Sir,

• I am afraid I have been too tedious in this Return, but since it contains nothing but simple Truth, it will be the wellcomer to you, and therefore is subscribed by

Your Humble and Faithful Servant,

W. P.

ADVERTISEMENT

THE following Propositions are taken out of such Books as are most in Vogue amongst the Scotch Presbyterians. They contain a short Account of their Moral Theology with regard to Obedience, Subjection, and Government. I desire the impartial Reader to let me know, wherein the Sentiments of the Kirk differ from the Doctrines propagated by the Jesuits. You have many of them gathered together in one view, not at all as an Answer to any of Mr. Ridpath's Scribbles, but as a sufficient Confutation of the impertinent Clamours against the Government of King Charles the Second. For since they were taught by their Religion to rebel against their

their King and Parliament, our Governours could not but secure the Peace of the Nation against such barbarous Practices as were indeed the natural Consequences of their Principles.

1. A Man ought no more to suffer when the Sentence is unjust, than he ought to do that which is unjust and sinful at the command of Authority. *Jus Pop. throughout.*

2. No Authority can command or can oblige until he himself that is commanded be convinced and persuaded that the thing is just, reasonable and expedient. *Gillasp. Ingl. pop. Cerem.*

3. To oppose the persons invested with Authority, is not to oppose the Ordinance of God, for the Ordinance of God is Magistracy in abstracto, that is it that we are commanded *Rom. 13.* not to resist, but the person of the King ought to be resisted. *Lex Rex pag. 265.* and when the Parliaments of both Kingdoms fought against the King's Person, they fought for his Royal Interest, and as he was a King, and the person of the King was absent, and denied his consent as a Man, yet they were as valid Parliaments as if he were personally present with them. *Lex Rex 270.*

4. Patient Suffering fall under no Law of God. *Lex Rex pag. 314. Vide Napht. pag. 157.*

5. The Presbytery hath the power of making peace and war, neither ought the Parliament enter into war without them no more than *Joshua* did offer battel without *Eleasar* the High Priest. *Acts Gen. Ass. 48. August 3.*

6. Since

*De Jure
Regni pag.
46, 47.*

6. Since Religion is the highest Interest of Mankind, it is not only lawful but necessary for private Subjects to rise in Arms against the King to reform the Abuses crept into it, and when the supreme Powers serve not the great Ends of Religion, we are *ipso facto* loos'd from all Tyes of Obedience to them. *Naph. pag. 154. Vide Jus Populi throughout.*

7. The Presbytery may excommunicate the King, and when he is excommunicated, none of his Subjects owe him Obedience, neither may they converse with him. *Jesuits and Presbyterians.*

8. There is nothing to be allowed of in the Worship of God as to its Order and Circumstance that is not founded on the express Letter of the Scripture, the unscriptural symbolical Ceremonies are the Badge of Antichrist. *All the Sectarians.*

9. It is a good Argument against any part of the Worship of God to have it abolished, that it was or is (ill to be found in the Mals Book. *Bailies Parallel of the Liturgy.*

10. It is lawful and necessary to enter into Covenants and Leagues without the King, and formally to protest against the King's most legal Methods to the contrary. *Prot. at the Cross Ed. 87. p. 38.*

11. The King having now for many years, usurped the power of Christ, and most palpably tyrannized in Civil Matters, he is to be deposed and brought to punishment, and all the Covenanted People of the Lord are to fight against him and his Adherents, under the Standard of Christ Jesus. *Sanctbor. Declar. 22. June 1680. and Cargill's Cov. throughout.*

12. It is downright Idolatry, and prejudicial to the Honour of Christ and the Interest of Reformation to appoint anniversary Days for Benefits bestowed on the King and Kingdom. *Apol. Narrat. Naph. p. 87.*

13. The minor part of a Kingdom that is for God, and his Cause against the King, if they be in a probable capacity to bring their Design to pass, ought by the Call of God to endeavour the Reformation of their Nation by Force of Arms. *Naph. and Jus Populi throughout.*

14. Tho our Saviour told his Disciples, *John 18. 36.* That his Kingdom was not of this World, and that they ought not to fight for him, yet it obliges not the Christians now, they may fight without and against the Consent of the supreme Magistrate. *Jus Pop. Pref. to the Reader, and Naph. pag. 159.*

15. The greatest reproach that the People of God could be exposed to, was to own the King's Proceedings, without Satisfaction to the covenanted People of God in both Kingdoms. *Vide Act of the West-Kirk.*

16. None have right to the Creature but the People of God, or Dominion is founded in Grace. *Enthus. and Sect.*

17. The Scott Covenant is the *Magna Charta* of all Religion and Righteousness, and not only obliges those who personally swore it, but the whole Nation to all succeeding Generations in all its Tendencies and natural Consequences. *Naph. pag. 83. and 185.*

18. The Success that the Presbyterians had in the late Troubles against the King and his Adherents, were undeniable Signs of God's Favour to that Party, and to follow and

and promote their Success, was to follow Providence.
Act. of Gen. Assen. frequently. And those who fought for the King fought against the Lord Jesus Christ. *Ibidem*
An. 45. P. 45. Naph. Pref. to the Reader, pag. 10. *Vide Reasonable Warning. An. 45.*

19. It is the Duty of the meanest Subject in his most private capacity (nay, they are indispensibly obliged to it) to admonish and reprove the King when they observe any thing that they think contrary or disadvantageous to the Presbyterian Interest and Reformation. *Naph. pag. 86.*

20. The covenanted People of God adhering to the faithful Ministers of Christ that owned the Cause and Covenant, and forsaking the Apostate Hirelings, the many Conversions wrought upon them were infallible Marks that God did approve them in their Proceedings against wicked Rulers. *Cup of Cold Water.*

21. The Change made in the Church of Scotland at the King's Return, from Presbytery to Episcopacy did naturally, and in its just Consequence and Tendency, overthrow the very Foundation of Religion, and the change is no less than from the pure Worship of God, to downright Idolatry. *Naph. Pref. to the Reader, pag. 4 and 5. Ibidem 84.*

22. Whoever is a sincere Seeker of God, and truly Regenerate, will immediately discern upon his looking of God, *ipso facto*, the profanity and wickedness of all that adhere to the Episcopal Church. *Naph. pag. 111.*

23. It was the peculiar Lot of the Church of Scotland, more eminently than any other Church upon Earth, to

contend against the Powers of this World, for the Scepter and Kingdom of Jesus Christ, by their Protestations, Petitions, Remonstrances, Declinations and all other Methods to advance Presbyterian Interest. *Naph. Pref. to the Reader, pag. 16.*

24. Papacy and Pclacy have one and the same Original, and their adherents are the Synagogue of Antichrist. *Naph. Pref. to the Reader, pag. 20. and pag. 154. and pag. 184. and pag. 53.*

25. The People of God in these Nations ought to rest assur'd that their Enemies shall be ruin'd and destroy'd, for the Lord hath said that the false Prophets shall pass out of the Land, and all that Countenance them shall be asham'd, and ought we not to believe what God himself hath said. *Naph. Pref. and pag. 153.*

26. No Ecclesiastick is oblig'd to give the King or his Council an account of any Doctrine Preached by him immediately, and *Prima instantia*, he is oblig'd to the Presbyterian Classis; and if the King meddle with him, or call him to an account immediately, he invades the Scepter of Jesus Christ, and if he arrogate unto himself the power of Convocating National or Provincial Synods, he confounds the Government of Jesus Christ with the Civil, and invades his Authority; therefore it is not safe, nor Scriptural Dialect, to say the King is Supreme Governour over all Persons, and in all Causes. *Naph. frequently, and page 38, and 40.*

The Royal Prerogative in cognoscing upon the Doctrine of Ministers, is the Devil's great design to encroach the Powers on Earth to the Prelates. *Ibidem.*

27. The

27. The Presbytry can Counter Act the Acts and Statutes of the Supreme Court of Parliament, and can forbid all the Subjects to obey those Laws, if imposed without their Consent. *July 28. Anno 1648. Act and Declaration against the Act of Parliament.*

28. No Man can enter lawfully to the Ministry, but by the Call of the People, but when the People are Malignant, then the Presbytery may give them a Minister. *Act. Gen. Assam. August 4. 1649.*

29. When the Presbytry appointed a Fast, upon King James his appointing of a Feast, they did nothing but what they were oblig'd in Conscience to do. *Lex Rex Pref. to the Reader.*

30. If the King will not Reform Religion, the Assembly of godly Pastors and People ought to Reform it, and they may swear a covenant without the King; and if he refuse to build the Lords House, they may relieve and defend one another, when they are oppress'd and hinder'd in the Work and Cause of God. *Lex Rex Pref. to the Reader.*

31. Inferiour Judges are no less essentially Judges, and God's Vice-Gerents on Earth than the King himself. *Lex Rex, page 159.*

32. The King is under the Law as to its Coercive limitation, and ought to be resisted by force of Arms. *Lex Rex, pag. 131. Douglas Coven. Str. pag. 23. and elsewhere frequently.*

Lex

33. The

33. The King is not the final and supreme Interpreter of the Law. *Lex Rex, pag. 172.*

34. The King's Prerogative Royal, and the Oath of Supremacy are directly contrary to the Word of God, and the Fundamental Laws of this Kingdom. *Naph. pag. 86.*

35. To allow that the present graceless Hirelings and Curates, had so much as an external Call to the Ministry, were as much as to make the God of Order, the Author of Confusion. *Naph. pag. 104, 105.*

And the true Zeal of God would inspire us to eradicate those Plants that our Heavenly Father never planted. *Ibidem pag. 108.*

And to bid the Covenanted People of God come to the Church, is the height of Oppression and Rigour. *Ibidem pag. 109.*

36. A King that transgresses the Law is degenerate into a Tyrant, and ought to be shaken amongst such as destroy the Peace and Advantages of Human Societies, because they transgress the limits and bounds of their Constitution, therefore are they hateful to God and men, and to be looked upon as no better than Wolves, Tigers, and Lions, and the death of such ought to be rewarded by the whole People, and every one of them. *De Jure Regni, pag. 36.*

37. The Oaths given by Intrants to their Bishops, at their Ordination, do not oblige at all, because they bind us to those Constitutions that were not allowed by the Presbytery. *Act. Gen. Assen. Decemb. 5. 1638.*

38. The

38. The call of a clear and necessary Providence, is enough for Christs Witnesses to resist and stand up against earthly Powers, and to this they are indispensably obliged, when they are in a probable capacity to act successfully, although the Motive of Self defence were not conjoin'd; and all such Combinations for Just and Necessary ends, are warranted before God and men, notwithstanding of any pretended Law to the contrary; and to affirm that the first and last Covenanters were acted by a Spirit of Rebellion, is in the next degree to the sin against the Holy Ghost. *Naph. pag. 7. 13. 14.*

39. The great Law of Self Preservation, in its immediate and most natural Effects, teach us, and indispensably obliges us to resist Kings, and all Superiour Powers when they command things contrary to the Word of God; nay when the great ends of Government are perverted, then the Bond thereof is dissolved, and the People thus liberated therefrom do relaps into their Primeve Liberty, and may upon the very same Principles Combine and Associate for their better defence, that they first enter'd upon unto Society. *Naph. pag. 14. 15. 16. 159.*

40. When the faithful of the Land are destitute of the best and surest means to overthrow the present Government and wicked Governours, they are still oblig'd to use their utmost endeavours. *Naph. pag. 155.*

41. We ought not to believe that the Primitive Christians were so numerous as the first Apologists for Christianity did give out, they were deceived in a Matter of Fact, for the sufferings of the Martyrs do not at all militate against the lawfulness of Defensive Arms. *Lex Rex, pag. 2. 71.*

42. The

42. The very power to Extirpate the present Government is God's Call to do so. *Cargil's New Cov. Art. 1.*

43. We are no more bound by any tie of Allegiance to the present Governours, than we are bound in Allegiance to the Devils. *Cargil's New Cov. Art. 9.*

If the *Scotch* Presbyterians under the former Reigns had satisfied themselves with the Theory of Rebellion, and if they had not actually practis'd according to the full extent and tendency of their Principles; then, their *Waitings* and *Seditious Sermons* might have been tolerated with the greater Ease: but since those active Gentlemen ventur'd upon the Natural Conclusions that their Principles yielded, so that none of the Kings Loyal Subjects knew but that they were to be murder'd as soon as they step out of Doors, I hope modest Men will allow that severe Laws were very necessary when the Holy Scriptures were perverted to destroy the General Peace of Mankind; and fiery Enthusiasts were made believe, that they might make bold with the Life of any Man, whom they took to oppose their own Dreams, if they fancy'd that their Neighbours were *Canaanites* and *Moabites*. Most of them that bawl'd against the Government of *Charles II.* are such as never understood the Temper of our Religious Incendiaries, or were themselves deeply engaged in the Rebellion; and therefore I have added to the former Papers, the following *Letter*, to undeceive such as are misinform'd, and to let the World see that it was impossible for our Kings and Parliaments to forbear the making of such Laws as our Enemies complain of; when the Holy Scriptures were wrested contrary to their True Meaning, and made to truckle under the hellish deluges of incorrigible Hypocrites. The following Paper is a very Authentick

thentick one, written by the famous Assassin Mr. *James Mitchel*, who attempted the Life of the Arch-Bishop of *St. Andrews* upon the Streets of *Edinburgh*, and in doing so, wounded the Bishop of *Orkney*. This Sacrilegious Effort he endeavours to justify from the Holy Scriptures: The Presbyterians cannot take it ill that the Monuments of their Martyrs are preserv'd; if they say that all Presbyterians have not such Principles, I say so too: but then, they must remember that such were the Presbyterians against whom the Laws were made under the former Reigns; and 'tis difficult to know whether all of them have not the same Principles, if once they are provok'd to anger, and if they are consequential to the Doctrine of the first Puritans:

for * *Goodman* saith expressly, That, *If the Magistrates shall refuse to put Mass-mongers and false Preachers to death, the People in seeing it perform'd shew that zeal of God which was commended in Phineas, destroying the Adulterers, and in the Israelites against the Benjamites.* Let any so-
* See dangerous Positions by Bishop Bancroft, p. 35.

ber Man consider what Improvements the Principles of the following Letter are capable of; and then let him tell me, whether he can water any Crimes punished by any Magistrates in any Corner of the World, more dangerous to human Society, than the Doctrines that he may read with his own Eyes in this Letter. I have copied it from that Collection of Mr. *Mitchel's* Papers, which his own Confederates took great care to Print and preserve in the latter Editions of *Naphtali*.

THE
 take advantage of my infirmity and weakness. You have
 not
 interest and care, hath encouraged me to write to you
 your real Friendship, and Love to Christ's Truth, People,
 portions wickedness. I say, the Confidence I have in
 motions and God concerning Conversion and salvation
 triumphed over terrors and torments, and in the
 examples of the saints and of the angels.

shenick one, written by the famous Abbot Mr. James
 Michal, who attempted the Life of the Arch-Bishop of
 St. Andrews upon the Streets of Edinburgh, and in doing so,
 wounded the Bishop of Orkney. This sacrilegious Effron-
 teries cannot take it ill that the Monuments of their Mar-
 tyrs are preserved; if they are all Presbyterians have
 not such Principles, I say is too; but then, they must re-
 member that such of the Presbyterians as are dis-
 tinguished by the former Reigns, and as dis-
 tinguished to know which all of them have not the same
 Principles, if once they are provoked to anger, and if they
 are consequential to the Doctrine of the first Puritans.

LETTER

OF A
 FROM

Edinburg Tolbooth, February 1674.

ME who may justly call my self less than the least of all
 Saints, and the chiefest of all Sinners; yet Christ
 Jesus calleth to be a Witness for his despised Truth, and
 trampled on Interests and Cause, by the wicked, blasphe-
 mous and God-contemning Generation, and against all their
 perfidious wickedness. Sir, I say, the Confidence I have in
 your real Friendship, and Love to Christ's Truth, People,
 Interest and Cause, hath encouraged me to write to you
 at this time, hoping you will not misconstrue me, nor
 take advantage of my Infirmary and weakness. You have
 heard of my Inditement, which I take up in these two
 particulars;

particulars, *First*, As they term it Rebellion and Treason, ancient which I answered to *My Lord Chancellor* in Committee, that it was no Rebellion, but a Duty which every one was bound to have performed in joyn-
 ing with that party, and I in the Year 1656, *Mr. R. L.* being then *Primar* in the Colledge of *Edinburg*, before our Laureation, tendered to us the *National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant*, upon mature Deliberation, I found nothing in them, but a short compend of the Moral Law, only binding us to our Duty, towards God and towards Men in their several Stations, and I finding, that our banished King's Interest lay wholly included therein, and both Coronation and Allegiance Oaths, &c. and they being the Substance of all Loyalty, and my Lord, it was well known, that many were taking the Tender, and for-
 swearing *Charles Stuart*, Parliament, and House of Lords, I then subscribed both, the doing of which, *My Lord Chancellor* would have stood at no less rate, it as well known, than this my present adhering and prosecuting the Ends thereof doth now, and when I was questioned what then I called Rebellion, I answered, it is in *Ezra vii. Verse 26. And whosoever will not do the Law of God and of the King, &c.* but being questioned before the Commissioner and the Council therea nent, I answered, as I said to my *Lord Chancellor* before, in the Year 1656, *Mr. R. L.* being then *Primar* in the Colledge of *Edinburg*, before our Laureation, he tendered to us the *National and Solemn League and Covenant*: He Stopt me, Saying, I'll wad ye are come here to give a Testimony: And then being demanded what I called Rebellion, if it was not Rebellion to oppose his Majesties Forces in the Face:

M

To

To the which I answered, viz. My Lord Chancellor,
 if it please your Grace, I humbly conceive they should
 have been with us, according to the National and So-
 lemn League and Covenant, at which Answer I per-
 ceived him to storm. But, saith he, I heard ye have
 been over Seas, with whom did ye converse there?
 Answer, with my Morechant: But, saith he, with
 whom in particular? Answer with one John Mitchel a
 Cousin of mine own. Saith he, I have heard of him,
 he is a Pastor in Rotterdam, to which I conceded. But,
 saith he, did ye not converse with Mr. Livingston, and
 such as he, to which I answered, I conversed with all
 our banished Ministers. To which he replied, ba-
 nished Traitors, ye will speak Treason at the Bar.
 Then he answered himself, saying, But they would call
 the shooting at the Bishop an Heroick Act. To which
 I answered, that I never told them any such thing, but
 where did you see James Wallcut last? Answer,
 Towards the Borders of Germany some years a-
 go. But what alled you at My Lord St. Andrews?
 (pointing at him with his Finger) Answer, My Lord
 Commissioner, the grievous Oppression, and horrid
 Bloodshed of my Brethren, and the eager pursuit after
 my own, as appeareth this day to your Grace, and to
 all his Majesties Honourable Privy Council. After
 which he commanded to take me away, that they
 might see what to do next with me.
 The Second is, the shooting of the Shot intended a-
 gainst the Bishop of St. Andrews, whereby the Bishop of
 Orkney was hurt, to which I answered My Lord Chan-
 cellor in private, viz. that I looked on him to be the
 main Instigator of all the Oppression and Bloodshed of
 my

my Brethren that followed thereupon, and the con-
 sidering pursuing after my own, and my Lord, as it was
 credibly reported to us (the Truth of which your
 Lordship knows better than we) that he kept up his
 Majesties Letter inhibiting any more Blood upon that
 Account, until the last Six was execute: And I being a
 Soldier, not having Laid down Arms, but being still
 upon my own Defence; and having no other End nor
 Quarrel at any Man (but according to my apprehen-
 sion of him) that as I hope in Sincerity with fixing
 either my Sense or Action upon the Covenant it self,
 as it may be understood by the many thousands of the
 Faithful, besides the Prosecution of the Ends of the
 same Covenant, which was, and in that point the Over-
 throw of Prelates and Prelacy, and I being a declared
 Enemy to him on that account, and he to me in like
 manner. So I never found my self obliged either by
 the Law of God, or Nature, to set a Centry at his
 Door for his Safety, but as he was always to take his
 Advantage, as it appeareth, so I of him, to take any
 Opportunity offered. Moreover, we being in no
 Terms of Capitulation, but on the contrary, by his
 Instigation being excluded from all Grace and Favour,
 thought it my Duty to pursue him at all occasions:
 Also My Lord, Sir William Sharp making his Apology,
 anent his unhandsome and cheating way taken, He
 took me, under pretence to have spoken with me about
 some other Matters: I not knowing him until five or
 six of his Brothers and his Servants were laying
 fast hold on me, they being armed of purpose, desired
 I would excuse him, seeing what he had done was
 upon his Brothers account, which excuse I easily ad-
 mitted, seeing that he thought himself obliged to do
 what

what he did to me, without Law or Order in behalf of his Brother; much more was I obliged to do what I did in behalf of many Brethren, whose Oppression was so great, and whose Blood he caused to be shed in such a bundance. Moreover, he persisting in his Bloody Murthers, as witnesseth the wounding of *Mr. Bruce* at his taking, by his Emissaries some few days before that fell out concerning himself. Now if by any means in taking him away, I could have put a stop to the then currant Persecution. Thus far I have truly resumed what passed.

But this Answer to the second part of the Inditement may be thought by some to be a step out of my ordinary way; wherefore I shall offer to your Consideration that passage *Deut. 23. 9.* wherein it is manifest, that the Seducer, or Inticer, to worship a false God, is to be put to death, by the Hand of those whom he seeks to turn away from the Lord, especially by the Hand of the Witnesses, whereof I am one, as it appeareth *Deut. 13.* which Precept I humbly take to be Moral, and not merely Judicial, and that it is not at all Ceremonial, or Levitical; And as every moral Precept is universal, as to the extent of Place, so also as to the extent of Time, and Persons. Upon which Command, Sir, I think that *Phinehas* acted in taking away the *Midianitish* Whore, and killed him whom she had seduced, *Num. 25. 8.* Also *Elijah* by virtue of that Precept gave Commandment to the People to destroy *Baals* Priests, contrary to the Command of the seducing Magistrate, who was not only remiss and negligent in executing Justice, but became a Protector and Defender of the Seducers. Then, and in that Case, I suppose it is the

Christians

Christians Duty not to be very dark. Moreover, we
 see that the People of *Israel* 2 *Chron.* 31. 1. destroyed
 Idolatry not only in *Judah*, wherein the King concurred,
 but in *Israel* and in *Manasseh*, where the King himself
 was an Idolater. And surely what all the People was
 bound to do by the Law of God, every one was bound
 to do it, to the uttermost of their power and capacity.
 And as it was in *Zach.* 13. 3. There the Seducer's Fa-
 ther and Mother shall put them to death: I take this to
 be meant of the Christian Magistrate: but when he is
 withdrawn by the Seducer from the Exercise of Office
 and Duty, and is become utterly remiss and negligent
 in putting the Seducer to death, according to God's ex-
 press Law, which is not to be expected of him, for then
 he should do Justice upon himself, but is become a
 Protector and Defender of the Idolater: then I doubt
 not, but that it doth become the Duty of every Chri-
 stian, to the uttermost of his power and capacity, to
 destroy and cut off both Idolatry and Idolaters. Yea,
 these presumptuously murdering Prelates ought to be
 called so by the Avenger of Blood, when he meeteth
 them, by the express Commandment of God, seeing
 the thing is manifestly true, and not to have liberty to
 flee to such Cities of Refuge, as the vain Pretext of Law-
 ful Authority: But they should be taken from the Horns
 of such Altars, and be put to death. Moreover, was it
 spoken concerning *Amalek*, upon the account he design-
 ed and resolved the Extirpation of the Lords People and
 Truth, which are his Throne, upon which he put forth
 his Hand, and because he took occasion against them,
Exod. 17. 14. *Num.* 24. 20. he endeavoured God should
 not have a People to serve him according to his Reveal-
 ed Will upon Earth: And if he could have effectuate
 his

• his Design, there should none have lived, who would
 • not have worshipped and served him, and his Idol-Gods:
 • And for the better effectuating his Design, he took occa-
 • sion against them, when they were wearied coming out
 • of Egypt, Deut. 29. 17, 18. and the Reason there an-
 • nounced is, he feared not God. And because I know
 • that the Bishops both will and do say, that what
 • they did against the Lords People, whom they
 • murdered, they did it by Law and Authority, but what
 • I did was contrary to both. I answer, the King himself
 • and all the Estates of the Land, and every individual
 • person of the Land, both were, and are obliged by the
 • Oath of God upon them, to have by Force of Arms
 • extirpated the perjured Prelates and Prelacy, and in
 • doing thereof to have defended their Lives and For-
 • tunes, the Covenants being engaged to on these Terms,
 • viz. after Supplications, Remonstrances, Protestations
 • and all other Lawful Means have been used now for
 • that Effect: As the last Remedy we took up Arms,
 • upon which condition, our Nobility, and all the Re-
 • presentatives of the Nation, according to the National
 • Covenant, and Solemn League and Covenant, gave to
 • the King both the Sword and the Scepter, and set the
 • Crown upon his Head; and he accordingly received
 • them, and promised and swore by the ever living God;
 • to use and approve them for the use aforesaid: And es-
 • pecially in order to the performing this Article, viz. the
 • Extirpation and Overthrow of Prelates and Prelacy,
 • and now they vaunt of Authority; of what Authority
 • do they mean or speak of, truly I know not, except it
 • be the Authority of their aggregated Gods, new Gods,
 • Gods of whom they have their Gain, Life and Stand-
 • ing, *Chemosh* or *Bacchus*, which drunken *Moad* delighted
 • to

'so dwell within dark Cells; *Asherah*; or *Heave*; whom
 'they worship of the female kind, because of their A-
 'dulteries and Whoredoms, as also *Malcome*, or *Molock*,
 'which signifies Tyrannical King, or a Devil, if they
 'will have it so, in whose Arms and Power they put their
 'poor Infants and Posterity to be burnt according to his
 'lust and pleasure, *Amos* 5. *vers*. 26. *Psalm* 106. 37. and
 'their Mammon, which they delight to worship daily, to-
 'gether with their own Bellies, whose glory is their shame,
 'who mind earthly things, whose end will be destruction,
 'except they repent; which there is little probability of,
 '*Ph*. 3. *vers*. 19. 40 which we may add their abominable
 'Pride, and blasphemous Perjuries, then their Gods will
 'be equal in number to the Whore their Mothers Sacra-
 'ments, from whom they have their Being, Strength
 'and Standing, and from the Devil their Father, who
 'was a Deceiver and Murderer from the Beginning.
 'And now seeing the Prelates possess whatever their
 'God *Chemosh* giveth them to possess: Then should
 'we not possess what the Lord our God giveth
 'us to possess, viz. the eternal Truths manifested
 'to us in his Revealed Will, and keep and defend
 'the same from all Innovations and Traditions of
 'his and our Adversaries, defend our Lives and Liber-
 'ties out of the Hands of our usurping Enemies, *Judg*.
 '8. 18. for sure I am, that God once dispossessed the
 'Prelates and Malignants of all these; and should they
 'again possess them through our Defect? God forbid! But
 'is the like of this! Work our murdering Prelates like her,
 'to whom plead like the Whore their Mother for Pious Obe-
 'dience, and that all the Lord's People, who may not
 'comply with their Idolatries and Perfidies, should lay
 'down

'down their Bloody Axe, with whom too many of our
 'hypocritical, time-serving and perfidious Professors
 'do agree, who had rather abide with *Reuben* among the
 'Sheepfolds, than jeopard Life or Fortune in the Help
 'of the Lord against the Mighty; do not consider the
 'bitter Curse pronounced by the Angel of the Lord a-
 'gainst *Meraz*, to which immediately he subjoins a
 'Blessing on *Jael* the Wife of *Heber* the *Kenite*. Others
 'excuse themselves thus, Vengeance is mine, and I will
 'repay it, but so the Throne of Judgment is the Lords,
 'and by this they will take away the Use and Office of
 'Magistracy, which erroneous Principles I detest: For
 'God even in the working of Miracles in dividing the Red
 'Sea, *Exod.* 14. 16. commanded *Moses* to stretch forth
 'his Rod: And Christ when he opened the Blind Man's
 'Eyes, maketh use of Clay and Spit, tho' indeed I
 'mean not of any who were willing to have helped, but
 'wanted Opportunity, yet there are many peevish time
 'serving Professors, who shall never suffer, so long as
 'they have either Soul or Conscience to mortgage, pro-
 'viding that they may keep them from suffering. And
 'if it will not do their Business, it seemeth before they
 'suffer, they resolve to sell all out at the Ground.

'Now, Sir, I have neither misinterpret Scripture, nor
 'misapplied it, in regard of the persons here hinted at,
 'nor been wrong in the end, which ought to be the
 'Glory of God, the Good of his Church and People.
 'Then I think that some persons ought to forbear to
 'scourge me so sore with their Tongues, while I am not
 'yet condemned by the common Enemy. And my hear-
 'ing of some things reported by some behind my Back,
 'hath occasioned my writing to you at this time. O, Sir,
 be

• be intreated to pray to the Lord in my behalf, that he
• would be pleased out of his Mercy and Goodness, to
• save me from sinning under Suffering in this Hour and
• Power of Darknes: For my Soul is prest within me
• in the Search betwixt Sin and Duty, viz. lest I should
• be niggard and too sparing of my life, when God calleth
• for it: And on the other hand, too prodigal and lavish
• of it, in not using all legal Defences in preserving of
• it, and in any of the like nature; I am in a strait, O
• Lord, undertake for me. *Sir*, I hope ye will excuse
• me in sending you these indistinct and irregular Lines,
• when you consider my present condition. *Sir*, believe
• me, I would many times, when I am before them,
• think a Scaffold a sweet Retirement, lest they should
• cheat and deceive me, in making me either to stain the
• declarative Glory of God, my own Conscience, or
• his People and Interests, and wronging of them, either
• by opening the Enemies Mouth against them, or letting
• loose their Hands upon them; henceforth let the Ad-
• versaries both say and do what they can, yet *the righte-*
• *eous shall hold on in his way, and he who hath clean*
• *hands will be stronger and stronger, Job 7. v. 9. But he*
• *that saith unto the wicked, thou art righteous, him shall*
• *the people curse, Nations shall abhor him, Prov. 24. v. 24.*
• Farewel in the Lord.

Sic subscribitur

Mr. JAMES MITCHEL:

FINIS,

N